

Models for Multiband IR Surveys

Cong Xu, Carol J. Lonsdale, David L. Shupe, JoAnn O'Linger, Frank Masci

Infrared Processing and Analysis Center, Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Caltech 100-22, Pasadena, CA 91125

Received Feb. 4, 2001; accepted _____

ABSTRACT

Empirical ‘backward’ galaxy evolution models for IR-bright galaxies are constrained using multiband IR surveys. A new Monte-Carlo algorithm is developed for this task. It exploits a large library of realistic Spectral Energy Distributions (SEDs) of 837 local IR galaxies (IRAS $25\mu m$ selected) from the UV ($1000\text{\AA}$) to the radio (20cm), including ISO-measured 3– $13\mu m$ unidentified broad features (UIBs). The basic assumption is that the local correlation between SEDs and Mid-Infrared (MIR) luminosities can be applied to earlier epochs of the Universe, an assumption which will be strongly tested by SIRTf. By attaching an SED appropriately drawn from the SED library to every source predicted by a given model, the algorithm enables simultaneous comparisons with multiple surveys in a wide range of wavebands. Three populations of IR sources are considered in the evolution models. These include (1) starburst galaxies, (2) normal late-type galaxies, and (3) galaxies with AGN. Constrained by data from the literature, our best-fit model (‘Peak Model’) predicts that since $z=1.5$ the population of starburst galaxies undergoes a very strong luminosity evolution ($L = L_0 \times (1+z)^{4.2}$) and also strong density evolution ($\rho = \rho_0 \times (1+z)^2$), the normal late-type galaxy population undergoes a passive luminosity evolution ($L = L_0 \times (1+z)^{1.5}$), and the galaxies with an AGN undergo a pure luminosity evolution similar to that of optical QSOs ($L = L_0 \times (1+z)^{3.5}$). Prior at $z \geq 1.5$ all evolution rates drop as $(1+z)^{-3}$. The luminosity evolution results in evolution of SEDs of IR-bright sources because of the luminosity dependence of the SEDs. Predictions for number counts, confusion limits, redshift distributions, and color-color diagrams are made for multiband surveys using the upcoming SIRTf satellite. A Λ -Cosmology ($\Omega_\Lambda = 0.7$, $\Omega_m = 0.3$, $H_0 = 75 \text{ km sec}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$) is assumed throughout the paper.

Subject headings: galaxies: starburst – Seyfert – luminosity function; infrared: galaxies

1. Introduction

The first sign of cosmic evolution among infrared (IR) galaxies was detected by Hacking, Condon and Houck (1987) in the IRAS $60\mu m$ deep survey (Hacking and Houck 1987). This was subsequently confirmed by later studies of IRAS galaxy populations (Franceschini et al. 1988; Lonsdale and Hacking 1989; Lonsdale et al. 1990; Rowan-Robinson et al. 1990; Saunders et al. 1990; Yahil et al. 1991; Gregorich et al. 1995; Pearson and Rowan-Robinson 1996; Bertin et al. 1997). Recently, deep MIR-FIR surveys have been carried out using the Infrared Space Observatory (ISO) (Kessler et al. 1996). These include ISOCAM surveys at $15\mu m$, $12\mu m$ and at $6.7\mu m$ (see Elbaz et al. 1998b for a summary of these observations), ISOPHOT surveys at $90\mu m$ (Oliver et al. 2000, Efstathiou et al. 2000a) and at $175\mu m$ (Kawara et al. 1998; Puget et al. 1999; Dole et al. 2001). The results from these surveys (Aussel et al. 1999; Puget et al. 1999; Dole et al. 2001; Clements et al. 1999; Elbaz et al. 1999; Serjeant et al. 2000; Xu 2000) indicate strong cosmic evolution in the population of infrared-emitting galaxies, confirming the earlier results based on smaller samples and less sophisticated analyses (e.g. Rowan-Robinson et al. 1997; Kawara et al. 1998). This is consistent with the results of SCUBA surveys (Hughes et al. 1998; Barger et al. 1998; Blain et al. 1999) and with the scenario hinted at by the newly discovered Cosmic IR Background (CIB) (Puget et al. 1996; Hauser et al. 1998; Dwek et al. 1998; Fixsen et al. 1998), while challenging the results from UV/optical surveys in the sense that substantially more (i.e. a factor of 3 – 5) star formation in the earlier Universe is required to match the IR/submm counts and the CIB (see, e.g. Rowan-Robinson et al. 1997) compared to that derived from the UV/optical surveys (Madau et al. 1998; Pozzetti et al. 1998, Steidel et al. 1999). The reason for this discrepancy is attributed to dust extinction which may hide much of the star formation in the early Universe from the UV/optical surveys (see Lonsdale 2000 for a review).

Compared to the UV and optical surveys, the infrared surveys are superior in their insensitivity to dust extinction, but are inferior in angular resolution (a few arcsecond compared to the sub-arcsecond resolution of optical surveys). This not only limits the IR surveys by confusion, but also makes the study of the IR morphology of faint IR sources impossible. In order to reveal the true nature of faint IR sources, identifications in other bands, especially in optical and NIR bands where the sources can be resolved easily with current instruments, are usually needed. The multi-band studies (including ISOCAM $15\mu m$ and $6.7\mu m$ surveys) of the Hubble Deep Field (HDF) by Rowan-Robinson et al. (1997) and Aussel et al. (1999), and of the Canada-France Redshift Survey (CFRS) field by Flores et al. (1999) suggest that, compared to their optical counterparts, the ISOCAM sources have significantly redder (I-K) colors (Flores et al. 1999), and are much more likely to be in the interacting/merging systems. On the other hand, such studies are

necessarily confined to IR sources that are relatively bright in the optical (e.g. $I \leq 22.5$ mag, Flores et al. 1999), while many IR bright galaxies are optically faint due to heavy dust extinction.

IRAS studies showed that galaxies of different nature in the local universe have distinct IR spectral energy distributions (SEDs). Galaxies with bright active galactic nuclei (AGN) usually have significantly lower $f_{60\mu}/f_{25\mu}$ ratios (de Grijp *et al.* 1985; Fang et al. 1998) than other galaxies. Interacting/starburst galaxies such as M82 have systematically high $f_{60\mu}/f_{100\mu}$ and $f_{25\mu}/f_{12\mu}$ ratios than normal galaxies such as the Milky Way (e.g. Helou 1986). In principle, these different characteristics in the IR SEDs for different populations of galaxies should facilitate a tool for identifications of IR galaxies when multi-band IR surveys are available, independent of the optical identifications. For ISO surveys this may not be very relevant because the ISOPHOT FIR surveys do not match the ISOCAM MIR surveys in depth due to severe degradation of the sensitivity of ISOPHOT detectors. However, when the Space Infrared Telescope Facility (SIRTF) is launched in mid 2002, simultaneous deep surveys in seven MIR-FIR bands ($3.6\mu m$, $4.5\mu m$, $5.8\mu m$, $8.0\mu m$, $24\mu m$, $70\mu m$, and $160\mu m$) will be possible (Bicay et al. 1999). These will include the Guaranteed Time Observer programs with MIPS and IRAC (sirtf.caltech.edu/ROC/Titles_abstracts.html), the large-area Legacy survey SWIRE (Lonsdale *et al.* 2001; and the very deep Legacy survey GOODS (Dickinson et al. 2001).

Significant K corrections will occur in the observed SEDs of faint sources in deep IR surveys. In particular, in the rest frame wavelength range between 3–20 μm there are several broad band features (see Puget and Léger 1989 for a review), often referred to the Unidentified Infrared Bands (UIBs), which are ubiquitously present in the MIR spectra of local galaxies with equivalent widths up to several microns (Helou et al. 2000), with the exception of type 1 Seyferts (Clavel et al. 2000). If these features are also present in the SEDs of high redshift galaxies, substantial K-corrections will result in when any of the features redshifts in or out of the band pass of an IR filter. These effects may indeed be beneficial rather than annoying, for they may facilitate IR photometric redshift techniques.

Xu et al. (1998, hereafter Paper I) studied the effect of K-corrections due to UIBs on number counts of MIR surveys. In that work, a three-component model, with empirically determined MIR SED templates of (1) a cirrus/PDR component (2) a starburst component and (3) an AGN component, is developed for infrared (3–120 μm) SEDs of galaxies. The model is then applied to a complete IRAS 25 μm selected sample of 1406 local galaxies ($z \leq 0.1$; Shupe et al. 1998). Results based on these 1406 spectra show that the MIR emission features cause significant effects on the redshift dependence of the K-corrections,

which in turn affect deep counts and redshift distributions in MIR surveys. In a subsequent paper, Xu (2000, hereafter Paper II) found that indeed the sharp peak at about 0.4mJy in the Euclidean normalized differential counts at $15\mu m$ (Elbaz et al. 1999) can be explained by the effects of UIBs, together with an evolution rate significantly stronger than derived in previous IRAS studies, eliminating the need for a hypothetical ‘new population’ (Elbaz 1998a).

In this paper, we expand the models in Paper I in several aspects.

- (1) First of all, the analytical algorithm of the number count model which includes a proper treatment of the K-correction (Eqs (23), (24) and (25) in Paper I) is replaced by a Monte-Carlo algorithm, in which every source (galaxy) in a volume of given redshift and in a given luminosity bin is assigned an SED appropriately selected from the SED library (837 SEDs). The source’s flux densities in different bands are then calculated by convolving the redshifted SED with the band passes of filters. In this way, we effectively simulate a virtual sky for a given evolution model. This not only enables the simultaneous comparison of counts in different bands, but also preserves the correlations between flux densities of different bands. This latter feature allowing us to predict color-color diagrams of different populations as a function of redshift, facilitating the exploration of photometric redshift indicators.
- (2) In the ‘backward evolution’ model, instead of treating all IR sources as a single population, in this work they are separated into three populations, in a similar spirit as in the model of Franceschini et al. (1988; see also Roche and Eales 1999): (1) normal late-type galaxies, (2) interacting/starburst galaxies, and (3) galaxies with AGNs. These different populations are assumed to have different cosmic evolution rates.
- (3) The wavelength coverage of our SED library is expanded from 3— $120\mu m$ to $1000\text{\AA}$ — 20cm. This is done by collecting from the literature the optical/NIR (B, J, H, Ks bands) magnitudes and the radio continuum (20cm) flux densities for galaxies in our SED sample, and by extrapolating from IRAS $60\mu m$ and $100\mu m$ bands to submm bands using empirically determined correlations.

The goal of this paper is to provide a set of comprehensive ‘backward evolution’ models (a category of galaxy evolution models in which number densities and other properties, e.g. luminosities in different bands, of local galaxies are evolved ‘backward’ in time from the present — i.e. with increasing redshift — according to some parametric prescriptions, see Lonsdale 2000 for a review) for future multi-band surveys, in particular those to be conducted with SIRTf. The model parameters will be constrained by observations

available in the literature. This not only includes the ISO deep surveys, but also the optical/NIR surveys, SCUBA surveys and radio deep surveys, because our SEDs now cover all of these wavebands. Constraints derived from the Cosmic IR Background (CIB) will also be incorporated. The strength of models being constrained by such wide range of data has already been demonstrated in several previous papers (e.g. Blain et al. 1999; Trentham, Blain and Goldader 1998; Adelberger and Steidel 2000; Rowan-Robinson 2001).

The model focuses on IR-bright galaxies, and therefore is not expected to match observed number counts in any band for which there is a substantial contribution from IR-quiet populations, eg. the K band, because E/S0 populations are missing from our model, and the bright radio counts, which are dominated by radio galaxies.

Throughout the paper, the cosmology model specified by the following parameters is adopted: $H_0=75$ km sec $^{-1}$ Mpc $^{-1}$, $\Omega_m = 0.3$, $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.7$.

2. SED Library

As in Paper I, our SED sample is drawn from the IRAS 25 μ m selected sample (complete down to $f_{25\mu} = 0.25$ Jy) by Shupe et al. (1998), and contains 1455 galaxies, 1406 of them with redshifts ≤ 0.1 . As pointed out by Spinoglio et al. (1995), the MIR luminosities correlate well with the bolometric luminosities. Therefore MIR selected samples, such as ours, have fair representations of different populations of IR sources. However E/S0s, which are $\sim 20\%$ of optically selected galaxy samples but mostly undetected by IRAS, are not included in our SED sample.

In Paper I, a three-component (cirrus/PDR, starburst, and AGN) MIR-SED model is applied to these galaxies, predicting an SED from 3–120 μ m for each of them. In order to expand the SEDs to the optical and NIR bands, B (4400Å), J (1.0 μ m), H (1.6 μ m), and Ks (2.2 μ m), we searched the literature. B magnitudes of 1339 galaxies were found in the NASA/IPAC Extragalactic Database (NED). The NIR magnitudes are taken mainly from the 2MASS Second Incremental Data Release via the IRSA facility¹ where J, H, and Ks magnitudes of 790 galaxies were found. In addition, NIR magnitudes of 413 galaxies in our sample are given

¹The NASA/IPAC InfraRed Science Archive (IRSA) is a NASA project focused on providing software and Internet services to facilitate astronomical discoveries, support the production of new astronomical data products, and to plan future observations utilizing the data archives from infrared astrophysics missions supported at Infrared Processing and Analysis Center (IPAC).

in Spinoglio et al. (1995), 244 of which are overlapped with the 2MASS matches. Whenever NIR magnitudes are available from both 2MASS and Spinoglio et al. (1995), 2MASS data take precedence. Altogether, J H and Ks magnitudes are found for 959 galaxies in our sample. The radio continuum flux densities at 20 cm, $S_{1.4GHz}$, were searched for in both the NVSS (Condon et al. 1998) and FIRST (Becker et al. 1995) catalogs of NRAO. Among 1406 galaxies in our sample 1170 are found in one of these two surveys (the rest are in the sky area not visible by VLA). It is found that 854 galaxies in our sample have B, J, H, Ks magnitudes and radio continuum flux at 1.4GHz. After excluding 17 galaxies which were undetected by IRAS both in the 60 μm and 100 μm bands (whose IR SEDs are highly uncertain), we select a final SED sample of 837 galaxies. Note that the 569 galaxies in the original sample (1406 galaxies) that do not make it into the final SED sample are mostly galaxies without NIR magnitudes. This is mainly due to the fact that data for NIR sources in a large fraction of the sky has not been released by the 2MASS survey (the major source of the NIR data) yet. Since both the 2MASS survey and the VLA surveys are much deeper than the IRAS survey, the NIR magnitudes or the 20 cm flux density is missing for a source in the 25 μm selected sample only when the sky region is missing in the corresponding database. Therefore no bias is introduced into the final SED sample when sources without NIR or radio fluxes are excluded.

For each galaxy in the SED sample, the broad-band UV-optical-NIR (1000Å – 4 μm) SED is estimated by a spline fit of the fluxes in B, J, H, Ks bands, altogether with the predicted 4 μm flux density from the MIR SED model (Paper I). It should be noted that at the UV wavelengths (1000 — 4000Å) the predicted fluxes are extrapolations from the available data, and caution should be applied when these predictions are used. This aspect of the model will be improved in the next paper, using the new UV data that are just now becoming available for ULIRGs and other IR-bright galaxies.

The MIR (4 – 16 μm) SED is determined using the MIR SED model developed in Paper I, including a full treatment of the UIB features (absent in type 1 AGN). Then the SED in the wavelength range 16 — 1200 μm is specified by a spline fit of IRAS data at 25, 60, 100 μm , together with the 16 μm flux density predicted by the MIR SED model, and the 170 μm , 240 μm , 450 μm , 850 μm and 1200 μm flux densities predicted by empirical correlations between the given submm band flux and the IRAS 60 μm and 100 μm fluxes which are derived from available submm data collected from the literature (Appendix).

The radio continuum flux density at 20cm ($S_{1.4GHz}$) is extrapolated to 6.2cm ($S_{4.8GHz}$) and 2.8cm ($S_{10.2GHz}$) using the mean spectral indices $\alpha_{20cm/6.2cm} = 0.79$ and $\alpha_{6.2cm/2.8cm} = 0.70$, found for Shapley-Ames galaxies (Niklas et al. 1997). These radio flux densities are then linked to the end of the

IR/submm SED at $1200\mu m$ by spline fit.

In Fig.1 we show the SEDs which are binned according to population (see the next section) and the $25\mu m$ luminosity (Table 1). For each bin, the mean SED and its 1σ dispersion are also plotted in the corresponding panel in Fig.1, and the values are listed in Table 2.

As examples, in Fig.2 observational data of twelve well known galaxies are compared with model SEDs. The data are collected from the literature, and the sources are

- broad band optical magnitudes: NED;
- NIR magnitudes: 2MASS and Spinoglio et al. (1995);
- FIR/submm flux densities: IRAS, Benford (1999), Dunne et al. (2000), Rigopoulou et al. (1996), Lisenfeld et al. (2000), Carico et al. (1992), Chini et al. (1986), Andreani and Franceschini (1996), Roche and Chandler (1993);
- radio continuum flux densities: Niklas et al. (1995), Condon et al. (1990).

The agreements between the data and the model SEDs are remarkably good in general.

3. 'Backward Evolution' Model for Multi-band Surveys

3.1. Three Populations of IR Emitting Galaxies and Their LLFs

In Paper I and Paper II, it is assumed that all IR sources evolve as a single population. Here we improve on that formulation by adopting a model in which IR sources can be separated into three populations, in a similar spirit as in the model of Franceschini et al. (1988; see also Roche and Eales 1999): (1) normal late-type galaxies, (2) interacting/starburst galaxies, and (3) galaxies with AGNs.

To enable these different galaxy populations to evolve at different rates, the model requires a local luminosity function (LLF) for each component. We began with the $25\mu m$ flux density-limited sample of 1455 galaxies of Shupe et al. (1998). Although classifications of many of the galaxies as AGNs, normal galaxies, etc. are available in databases such as NED, to treat the sample in a more uniform way, we use IR-color-based criteria to divide our sample into different populations (see Paper I and Fang et al. 1998 for a discussion). We chose the following IRAS color boundaries:

- “AGNs”: $f_{60\mu m}/f_{25\mu m} \leq 5$
- “Starbursts”: $f_{60\mu m}/f_{25\mu m} > 5$ and $f_{100\mu m}/f_{60\mu m} < 2$.
- “Normals”: $f_{60\mu m}/f_{25\mu m} > 5$ and $f_{100\mu m}/f_{60\mu m} \geq 2$.

This division results in 356 galaxies classified as “AGNs”, 456 galaxies as “Normal”, and 643 galaxies as “Starburst”. We note that our color-selection method for AGN will not be appropriate for heavily obscured objects in which even the $f_{60\mu m}/f_{25\mu m}$ color may be affected by reddening; instead any such IR-red AGN will be found in the ‘starburst’ sample. Also, for many AGNs as defined above, much of the IR radiation can be due to the emission of dust heated by stars in the host galaxy in addition to the dust emission associated with the AGN. For example, according to Eq(1) of Paper I, an IR source of $f_{60\mu m}/f_{25\mu m} = 5$ (an ‘AGN’ by the above definition) has a half of its $25\mu m$ emission from dust heated by stars. In reality, Seyfert galaxies such as NGC 4945 (Spoon et al. 2000) can have the IR emission predominantly powered by the nuclear starburst rather than by the AGN. This explains why the SEDs of some sources in the AGN subsample of our SED library show significant broad band MIR emission features (Fig.1a) which should be absent in a typical type 1 AGN SED (e.g. Fig.3 of Paper I). At the same time, as shown in Fig.2, the UIB features are indeed absent in the model SEDs of AGNs such as Mrk 231 and NGC 7479, consistent with the fact that the emission in these sources is dominated by the AGN. It should also be noted that in our SED model (Paper I), we do not distinguish type 1 and type 2 AGNs, which have significantly different MIR SEDs (Clavel et al. 2000). Many type 2 AGNs have strong UIB features even when their IR emission may be predominantly from dust associated with AGN, because an edge-on torus may heavily extinguish the MIR part of the AGN-associated emission and therefore the detected MIR emission is mostly from dust in the ISM of the host galaxy (Clavel et al. 2000).

Luminosity functions were then computed for each of these populations according to the maximum-likelihood method described in Yahil et al. (1991) and used in Shupe et al. (1998). This method calculates the shape of a parametric luminosity function described by the parameters α , β and L_* independent of density variations.

With the shape parameters in hand, the normalization of each luminosity function must be estimated by other methods. Since the normalization of the total 25 micron luminosity function was estimated in Shupe et al. (1998), the normalizations of the three population LFs are chosen so that the the number of galaxies implied by the sum of the component LFs is about the same as the total LF. The difference between

the total LF and summed LF is also constrained to be less than a few percent at all luminosities. We have adjusted the normalizations of the component LFs to satisfy these criteria. These relative weightings of the component LFs can be adjusted by ten to twenty percent while still satisfying the criteria, but cannot be made vastly different from the nominal values.

A plot of the component luminosity functions, the sum of the component LFs, and the total LF is shown in Fig.3. The computed parameters for each population are given in Table 3. Note that the LFs are calculated using the whole sample (1455 galaxies) of Shupe et al. (1998). Identical results are obtained when the sample is confined to the 1406 galaxies with $z < 0.1$.

3.2. Monte-Carlo Simulation of Multi-band Surveys

In this subsection, we develop the algorithm to model coherently the number counts in different bands and the color-color diagrams for multi-band surveys.

In a flat Λ -Universe (i.e. $\Omega = \Omega_m + \Omega_\Lambda = 1$, $\Omega_\Lambda \neq 0$), which is adopted in this work, the co-moving volume is

$$V = \frac{A}{3} D_M^3 \quad (1)$$

where A is the sky coverage in steradians, and D_M is the proper motion distance (Carroll et al. 1992)²:

$$D_M = \frac{c}{H_0} \int_0^{z^1} [(1+z)^2(1+\Omega_m z) - z(2+z)\Omega_\Lambda]^{-1/2} dz \quad (2)$$

The predicted number of sources from a given population, in a given redshift interval $[z - 0.5\delta z, z + 0.5\delta z]$ and in a given $25\mu m$ luminosity interval $[L - 0.5\delta L, L + 0.5\delta L]$, is then

$$\delta N_i(L, z) = \rho'_i(L, z) \frac{dV}{dz} \delta L \delta z \quad (3)$$

where ρ'_i is the luminosity function of population i ($i = 1$ – normal late type galaxies, $i = 2$ – starburst galaxies, and $i = 3$ – galaxies with AGNs):

$$\rho'_i(L, z) = G_i(z) \rho_i \left(\frac{L}{F_i(z)} \right); \quad (4)$$

² The D_A , the angular diameter distance in Section 4.1 of Paper I, should have been called D_M , the proper motion distance, too.

where ρ_i is the local $25\ \mu\text{m}$ luminosity function (luminosity function at $z=0$) of population i (Section 3.1), and $G_i(z)$ and $F_i(z)$ are the density evolution function and the luminosity evolution function of population i , respectively.

For each of the $\delta N_i(L, z)$ sources predicted using Eq(3), an SED is randomly selected from a proper SED bin in the SED library (Section 2) and is assigned to the source. The SED library is binned according to (1) the population, and (2) the $25\mu\text{m}$ luminosity (Table 1). For an individual source the flux density in a given band can then be determined as follows:

$$f_{band} = \frac{1}{4\pi D_L^2} \times \frac{L_{25\mu\text{m}}/25\mu\text{m}}{S(25\mu\text{m})} \int_{\lambda_1}^{\lambda_2} S\left(\frac{\lambda}{1+z}\right) R_{band}(\lambda) d\lambda \quad (5)$$

where

$$D_L = (1+z) \times D_M \quad (6)$$

is the luminosity distance (Carroll et al. 1992), $L_{25\mu\text{m}} = \nu L_\nu(25\mu\text{m}) = \lambda L_\lambda(25\mu\text{m})$ is the monochromatic luminosity at $25\mu\text{m}$, $R_{band}(\lambda)$ is the bandpass of the given band, and $S(\lambda)$ is the flux density distribution of the SED in question. Due to the dependence of SED shape on luminosity for IR-bright galaxies (the $f_{60\mu}/f_{100\mu}$ color increases with L_{IR}), this approach empirically results in color evolution accompanying luminosity evolution.

When the evolution functions in Eq(4) are specified, we can predict counts in different IR bands, as well as contributions from IR galaxies to counts in other wavebands. As a test, local luminosity functions in the IRAS $60\mu\text{m}$ band (Fig.4), in the SCUBA $850\ \mu\text{m}$ band (Fig.5), and in the IRAM $1250\mu\text{m}$ band (Fig.6) are calculated via model simulations (for sources of $z < 0.1$) specified by $G_i(z) = 1$ and $F_i(z) = 1$. Good agreement with the IRAS $60\mu\text{m}$ luminosity function of Saunders et al. (1990), with the $850\mu\text{m}$ luminosity function of Dunne et al. (2000), and with the $1250\mu\text{m}$ luminosity function of Franceschini et al. (1998) is found.

3.3. Evolution Models

As in Paper I and Paper II, the following (power-law) function forms are adopted for the luminosity evolution functions $F_i(z)$ and the density evolution functions $G_i(z)$:

$$\begin{aligned} F_i(z) &= (1+z)^{u_i} \quad (z \leq z_1) \\ &= (1+z)^{v_i} \quad (z_1 < z \leq z_0) \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 G_i(z) &= (1+z)^{p_i} \quad (z \leq z_1) \\
 &= (1+z)^{q_i} \quad (z_1 < z \leq z_0)
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{8}$$

where z_0 is the redshift when the galaxy formation started, and z_1 is the so called ‘peak’ redshift, where the evolution reaches a peak. Here we explore two kinds of models, the first characterized by a steady increase in evolution from z_0 to z_1 at power law rates v_i and q_i followed by a strong decline to the present day with power law rates u_i and p_i , and the second having a plateau between the formation and peak epochs, $z_0 > z > z_1$.

Throughout the paper we adopt $z_0 = 7$ and $z_1 = 1.5$. Our results (predictions for number counts and the CIB) are not sensitive to z_0 so long as it is > 5 . Optical surveys (e.g. Lilly et al. 1996; Madau et al. 1996; Connolly et al. 1997) show that star formation rate in galaxies peaks between $z = 1$ and $z = 2$. The deep ISOCAM counts (e.g. Elbaz et al. 1999) are consistent with a rapidly increasing star formation rate going back at least to $z \geq 1.5$ (Paper II). The choice of 1.5 for the peak redshift is driven by the deep ISO $15\mu m$ data (see Fig.7). It is still controversial whether the star formation rate indeed decreases at $z > z_1$, beyond the peak, or flattens (e.g Steidel et al. 1999; Blain et al. 1999).

Other parameters are u_i, v_i, p_i, q_i ($i=1, 2, 3$). In order to reduce further the parameter space, we assume:

- (1) For normal late type galaxies (population 1): $u_1 = 1.5$, $p_1 = 0$. This corresponds to a pure passive luminosity evolution before the turn-over redshift. These galaxies are a major constituent of K-band extragalactic source counts, which may be consistent with passive evolution models (Gardener et al. 1997).
- (2) For galaxies with AGNs (population 3): $u_3 = 3.5$, $p_3 = 0$. Here the assumption of the pure luminosity evolution is based on the studies of the evolution of QSOs in the literature (e.g. Boyle et al. 1988; Pei 1995; La Franca et al. 2000). Using a maximum-likelihood technique Boyle et al. (1988) found that pure luminosity evolution models of form $L(z) \propto L_0 \times (1+z)^\gamma$ ($\gamma = 3.2 \pm 0.1$) adequately describe the evolution of bright ($M_B < -23$) low redshift ($z < 2.2$) QSOs. A similar result was found by Pei (1995), with γ in the range of 3.2 — 3.9. Recently, La Franca et al. (2000) found that results from an ISOCAM $15\mu m$ survey of Type 1 AGNs in the ELAIS fields are consistent with a pure luminosity evolution model with $L(z) \propto L_0 \times (1+z)^{3.4}$.
- (3) The evolution indices u_2 and p_2 , which specify the luminosity and density evolution rate of starburst

galaxies before $z = 1.5$, will be the free parameters. Given the results of Paper II on the evolution of deep ISOCAM counts, it is expected that at $z < 1.5$ the starburst galaxies will have a stronger evolution rate than what has been assumed for normal late-type galaxies (assumption (1)) and for galaxy with AGNs (assumption (2)), consistent with the preliminary identifications of faint ISOCAM sources (Flores et al. 1999).

- (4) Again for the sake of simplicity, we assume that all above mentioned evolution rates will have the same behavior after $z = z_1$, namely $v_1 = v_2 = v_3 = q_2$. This is because beyond $z \simeq 1.5$ (the highest redshift detected for ISO galaxies), we know very little about the population of IR galaxies.

4. Comparisons with Available Surveys and Constraints on Evolution Parameters

4.1. Comparisons with ISOCAM $15\mu m$ Band Surveys: Constraints on Evolution of $z < 1.5$

In what follows, we will compare our simulations with surveys in different bands found in the literature. The evolution models considered in this paper are listed in Table 4.

We start with the surveys in ISOCAM $15\mu m$ band (Elbaz et al. 1999; Serjeant et al. 2000), where the deepest and the most comprehensive ISO surveys have been conducted. Due to significant effects caused by the UIBs, certain features in the MIR counts can help to constrain the rate of luminosity evolution and that of density evolution separately (Paper I). If the sharp peak at $f_{15\mu m} \simeq 0.4 mJy$ in the Euclidean normalized differential counts is indeed due to the UIBs in $6 - 8 \mu m$ (Paper II), which are redshifted into the $15\mu m$ band when $z \sim 1$, then a $15\mu m$ luminosity of $\sim 10^{11} L_{\odot}$ (νL_{ν} at $15\mu m$) could be inferred for a typical $z=1$ ISOCAM galaxy. This imposes a strong constraint to the luminosity evolution rate of the major population of the ISOCAM sources, which under our assumptions (Section 3.3) are the starburst galaxies, at $z \lesssim 1$.

In Fig.7a and Fig.7b, we compare the simulations of two evolution models, one has $p_2 = 2$, $u_2 = 4.2$, $z_1 = 1.5$ and $v_1 = v_2 = v_3 = q_2 = -3$ (Model 1, ‘Peak Model’) and the other $p_2 = 2$, $u_2 = 4.2$, $z_1 = 1.5$ and $v_1 = v_2 = v_3 = q_2 = 0$ (Model 2, ‘Flat Model’) with the number counts of ISOCAM $15\mu m$ data surveys (Elbaz et al. 1999; Serjeant et al. 2000). Both models fit the ISO data very well. Namely, although the ‘Flat Model’ predicts about a factor of 2 more sources at $f_{15\mu m} = 0.01 mJy$, there is little difference between the two models above the sensitivity limit of ISOCAM surveys ($0.1 mJy$). At $0.1 mJy$ the $15\mu m$ counts are very insensitive to galaxy evolution at $z > 1.5$.

In Fig.7c, 7d simulations of two other evolution models, Model 3 ($p_2 = 1$, $u_2 = 5$, $z_1 = 1.5$, $v_1 = v_2 = v_3 = q_2 = -3$) and Model 4 ($p_2 = 3$, $u_2 = 3.5$, $z_1 = 1.5$, $v_1 = v_2 = v_3 = q_2 = -3$) are also plotted. The former assumes more luminosity evolution ($u_2 = 5$) and less density evolution ($p_2 = 1$) for the starbursts at $z < 1.5$. It gives a slightly less good fit to the $15\mu m$ data (Fig.7c), predicting a shallower peak at slightly brighter flux level than that of the data. The latter assumes less luminosity evolution ($u_2 = 3.5$) but more density evolution ($p_2 = 3$) for the starbursts before $z \leq 1.5$. It fits the $15\mu m$ data very well (Fig.7d).

In Fig.8, we compare the redshift distributions predicted by the ‘Peak Model’ model and by the ‘Flat Model’ with the data. Both the data of Aussel et al. (1999) and of Flores et al. (1999) are assumed to be complete at the 50% level (i.e. half of the sources are missing from the two plots due to lack of redshifts). By definition (Table 4), the ‘Peak Model’ and the ‘Flat Model’ differ only at $z > 1.5$. For the HDF-North survey, the model predicts a slightly higher median z (~ 1) compared to the median of the data ($z \sim 0.7$). However, since the redshift data are not complete and the high redshifts are more likely to be missing (more difficult to measure), and since the HDF-North is such a tiny field that any cluster at a given redshift (e.g. at $z \sim 0.7$) can affect the redshift distribution significantly, we feel this discrepancy is not inconsistent with our models. The CFRS survey is shallower (and wider) than the HDF-North survey, but its redshift distribution is more skewed toward the high z end, supporting our argument that the z distribution of the ISOCAM sources in the HDF-North field might not be representative for $f_{15\mu m} > 0.1$ sources. The ‘Peak Model’ predicts a median redshift of 0.75 for the CFRS survey, very close to that of the data.

4.2. Comparisons with the CIB and the SCUBA $850\mu m$ Band Surveys: Constraints on Evolution of $z > 1.5$

Because of the negative K-correction in the submm bands, the best constraints on galaxy evolution beyond $z \sim 2$ come from the CIB and the submm counts. Our model predictions for the CIB are derived by summing up the flux densities of all sources in a very deep simulation ($f_{24\mu m} \geq 10^{-9} mJy$), for the band in question. In Fig.9 we compare the CIB predicted by four different models to the observations. The solid curve is obtained by the ‘Peak Model’, which fits the CIB very well (except for the $60\mu m$ point of Finkbeiner et al. 2000). The dotted curve is the result of the ‘Flat Model’, which over predicts the submm CIB substantially (by a factor of ~ 2). The stronger density evolution model in Fig.7c (Model 4, dot-dashed curve in Fig.9) over-predicts the CIB by $\sim 30 - 50\%$. In particular, it marginally violates the upper limits

set by the TeV gamma-ray observations (Stanev and Franceschini 1998) in the MIR. Another model (Model 5) which is otherwise same as the ‘Peak Model’ except for a less steep drop ($v_1 = v_2 = v_3 = q_2 = -1.5$ instead of $v_1 = v_2 = v_3 = q_2 = -3$) after $z=1.5$, is also plotted in Fig.9 (dashed curve). It slightly over-predicts the CIB around $300\mu m$.

In Fig.10 we compare results from simulations of the ‘Peak Model’ and of the ‘Flat Model’ to the $850\mu m$ SCUBA counts. As in the case of the CIB comparisons, the ‘Peak Model’ fits the data very well, while the predictions of the ‘Flat Model’ are significantly higher than the data.

4.3. Comparisons between Best-fit Model and the Surveys in Other Bands

The agreements between the predictions of our best-fit model, the ‘Peak Model’, and the data from the ISO surveys at $90\mu m$ (Fig.11) and at $175\mu m$ (Fig.12) are very good. Note that near the faint ends of the $175\mu m$ counts, incompleteness at level of $\gtrsim 50\%$ is expected (Dole et al. 2000). Corrections for this incompleteness in those data will make the agreement between our model predictions and the data even better.

These good agreements may not be very surprising given that the model plotted here is mostly constrained by fitting the $15\mu m$ survey data (Fig.7), and that the three FIR bands are linked to the $15\mu m$ band by a SED model that is very robust (Section 2). In Fig.13 the predictions of our best-fit model are compared with the IRAS surveys at $60\mu m$ (Fig.13). Here the data show a large spread, and our model is about 10% higher relative to the data at $\log f_{60} < 0.3$ (Jy) if the Gregorich et al. (1995) data are ignored (they may suffer from over-estimated; Bertin *et al.* (1997)). If real, the small over-prediction of these bright counts might be a consequence of a high local normalization (cf. Lonsdale *et al.* 1990). We will investigate this possibility further in our next paper.

We compare the redshift distribution of IRAS $60\mu m$ sources observed by Oliver et al. (1996) and that predicted by our best-fit model in Fig.14. The overall agreement looks quite good. On the other hand, there seems to be a slight excess of data points in the low z region ($z < 0.014$) and the opposite in high z ($z > 0.033$) region. It is not clear whether these are due to large scale structures (the amplitudes of the deviations are of the same order as the fluctuations due to the large scale structures) or they hint that the luminosity evolution rate of the best-fit model is too strong. It is also not clear whether the low fraction of high z galaxies could be explained, at least partially, by the incompleteness of the redshift survey ($\sim 10\%$,

Oliver et al. 1996). Future deeper surveys will certainly help to answer these questions.

Finally we present the predicted contributions of IR-bright sources to the counts in the NIR K band, the optical B band, and the radio continuum 20cm band, and compare them with survey data from the literature. Again only the predictions of our best-fit model, the ‘Peak Model’, are considered here. Euclidean normalized differential counts in K band are plotted in Fig.15. Compared to the data points taken from various K band surveys (Soifer et al. 1994; Gardner et al. 1996; Bershadsky et al. 1998; Minezaki et al. 1998), the ‘Peak Model’ predicts that for $K < 22$, about 50 to 80% of the sources are IR bright, in reasonable agreement with the fraction of late-type galaxies among K band sources (Huang et al. 1998). It appears that the model prediction is significantly below the counts of $K > 22$, though there are only two data points there. A tentative comparison with HST NICMOS H band deep counts (Storrie-Lombardi, private communication) shows that the ‘Peak Model’ predicts about 50% of the NIR counts down to $H=26.5$ mag.

In Fig.16, we compare predicted contributions from IR sources to the B band counts. Since the E/S0 galaxies constituent only $\sim 20\%$ of the optical galaxies (Glazebrook et al. 1995), which is a general result holding even for a very faint sample down to $m_I \simeq 24.25$ mag (Driver et al. 1995), IR-bright sources should dominate the B band counts. The discrepancy near the bright end ($B \sim 15$) could be explained by the local density enhancement (local super-cluster). At the faint end ($B > 25$), the ‘Peak Model’ also slightly under-predicts the counts by $\sim 50\%$. It should be noted that at these faint B band flux levels, where many sources have high redshifts and the B band flux is actually due to the rest frame UV emission, the model predictions suffer large uncertainties because the UV SEDs used in the calculation are not well constrained (Section 2). This will be the focus of our next paper.

In the radio continuum 20 cm band, the bright sources ($> 1mJy$) are mostly due to the early-type radio galaxies (Condon 1984) which are not IR emitters, while the faint, sub-mJy sources are mostly late-type galaxies (Condon 1984). This is indeed what the ‘Peak Model’ predicts (Fig.17): at flux levels brighter than 1 mJy, the IR sources contribute less than 10% of radio counts. At faint flux levels ($\sim 0.1mJy$), they can fully account for the radio counts.

5. Predictions for Multi-Band SIRTf Surveys

5.1. Number Counts and Confusion limits

In this section we will make predictions using our best-fit model (‘Peak Model’). We will concentrate on future surveys with SIRTf, which will be launched in mid 2002. All three MIPS bands ($24\mu m$, $70\mu m$, $160\mu m$) and all four IRAC bands ($3.6\mu m$, $4.5\mu m$, $5.8\mu m$ and $8\mu m$) bands are considered. For the sake of simplicity, we assume all SIRTf bandpasses are 10% ($\lambda/\delta\lambda = 10$)³. We note that, since the E/S0 galaxies are not included in the model, we may significantly underpredict the counts in the IRAC bands, particularly for the shorter wavelength bands (i.e. the $3.6\mu m$, $4.5\mu m$, and $5.8\mu m$ bands). Therefore, our predictions for the counts and the confusion limits in these bands should be treated as lower limits.

In Fig.18 we plot the predicted integral counts for the three MIPS bands and three IRAC bands ($3.6\mu m$, $5.8\mu m$ and $8\mu m$). In all MIPS bands, the counts are dominated by the starburst component (including any heavily obscured AGN). In the IRAC bands, normal spirals and galaxies with AGNs give significant contributions to counts brighter than $0.3mJy$ (in the $3.6\mu m$ and $5.8\mu m$ bands they out-number the starbursts). At fainter flux levels ($< 0.1mJy$) the starburst component dominates the counts in the IRAC bands as well.

Confusion limits shown in Fig.18 have been computed from the predicted number counts, assuming parameters appropriate for SIRTf. The method used is the same as that used by Hacking and Soifer (1991)—namely, summing (in quadrature) the contributions from all sources fainter than the limit within the beam, via numerical integration of Eq. (19) in Hacking and Houck (1987). An Airy function computed from the nominal wavelength is used for the beam. For wavelengths greater than $6\mu m$, a telescope diameter of 85 cm is used in accordance with the required diffraction-limited performance of the SIRTf telescope. For wavelengths shorter than $6\mu m$, an effective telescope diameter is used to make the beamsize larger. Specifically, an effective diameter of 82 cm is used for $5.8\mu m$, and 51 cm is used for $3.6\mu m$. As noted above, the confusion limits for the short wavelength IRAC bands such as the $5.8\mu m$ and the $3.6\mu m$ bands should be treated as lower limits because of the omission of the contribution from counts due to E/S0 galaxies. Also for the MIPS $160\mu m$ band, confusion caused by Galactic cirrus may be significant, especially in high cirrus regions (Gautier et al. 1992; Helou and Beichman 1990).

In Fig.19 redshift distributions predicted by the best-fit model (‘Peak Model’) and by the ‘Flat

³See “*Space Infrared Telescope Facility (SIRTf) — Observer’s Manual (Version 1.0)*” for details of SIRTf instruments.

Model’ are plotted. For a $24\mu m$ survey limited at $f_{24\mu m} = 0.055 mJy$ ($5\sigma_{conf}$), the best-fit model predicts a prominent peak at about $z=1$. The starburst component overwhelmingly dominates the counts at $z > 0.5$, while the normal galaxies dominate the small z end. The contribution from galaxies with AGNs is never important ($< 10\%$), although it could be significantly higher for obscured AGNs classified here as “starbursts” due to their colors. The shape of the redshift distribution predicted by the ‘Flat Model’ is very different, with a second peak at $z \sim 2$, caused mainly by the prominent UIB features between $6 - 8\mu m$ (Paper I). This peak is cut off in the ‘Peak Model’ because of the steep decrease of the star-formation rate at $z > 1.5$. However, the turn-over redshift z_1 , which has been assumed to be 1.5 in all our models presented here, is poorly constrained because ISO surveys are too shallow whereas the SCUBA and CIB are more sensitive to sources at $z > 3$. If in reality $z_1 > 2$, then it will be revealed by the second peak at $z \sim 2$ in the redshift distribution of SIRTf $24\mu m$ sources.

5.2. SIRTf Color-Color Diagrams

In Fig.20a and Fig.20b we plot the $f_{24\mu m}/f_{8\mu m}$ vs. $f_{70\mu m}/f_{24\mu m}$ color-color diagrams predicted by the ‘Peak Model’ and the ‘Flat Model’, respectively. Simulations of both models are confined to 1 deg^2 with the following flux limits: $f_{24\mu m} \geq 0.055 mJy$ ($5\sigma_{conf}$) and $f_{70\mu m} \geq 2.6 mJy$ ($2\sigma_{conf}$). Some general trends are visible in these plots. Galaxies with AGNs are mostly in the relatively low $f_{70\mu m}/f_{24\mu m}$ ratio region ($\log(f_{70\mu m}/f_{24\mu m}) \lesssim 1$), while starburst galaxies dominate the high $f_{70\mu m}/f_{24\mu m}$ ratio region ($\log(f_{70\mu m}/f_{24\mu m}) \gtrsim 1$). Normal galaxies, with relatively low luminosities and therefore seen only with $z < 1$, are concentrated in the low $f_{24\mu m}/f_{8\mu m}$ ratio region. It should be pointed out that these trends are closely related to our definitions of the three populations (Section 2), which are separated according to the IRAS color ratios of $f_{60\mu m}/f_{25\mu m}$ and $f_{25\mu m}/f_{12\mu m}$. While the criteria adopted are based on empirical correlations (Fang et al. 1998; Paper I), the clear boundaries in the definitions of the different populations will have artificially enhanced the trend shown here.

In Fig.21a and Fig.21b we plot the predictions by the same two models for the MIPS color-color diagram, namely $f_{160\mu m}/f_{70\mu m}$ vs. $f_{70\mu m}/f_{24\mu m}$. The symbols are the same as in Fig.20. In these plots, in addition to the flux cut-offs of $f_{24\mu m} \geq 0.055 mJy$ and $f_{70\mu m} \geq 2.6 mJy$, it is also required that $f_{160\mu m} \geq 38 mJy$ ($2\sigma_{conf}$). The simulations cover 10 deg^2 . Most high z galaxies (large crosses in the plots) are concentrated in the high $f_{160\mu m}/f_{70\mu m}$ end ($\log(f_{160\mu m}/f_{70\mu m}) \gtrsim 0.7$), due to the K-correction effect associated with the curvature in the $20-160\mu m$ wavelength range in most of the SEDs in our library.

The apparent ‘tracks’ in these figures are a result of the manner in which an SED is selected for each simulated galaxy from the SED library. As luminosity increases with increasing z (for luminosity evolution models) a model galaxy is assigned a random SED from the relevant luminosity bin. Some bins contain small numbers of SEDs so the ‘tracks’ reflect single SEDs randomly assigned to model galaxies at higher and higher z (and therefore L). The ‘tracks’ can discontinue when model populations ‘jump’ to higher SED library luminosity bins. Although small random scatter could be incorporated into these model colors, we have chosen not to do that so that the figures can be more easily analyzed.

The IRAC color-color diagrams, such as $f_{4.5\mu m}/f_{3.6\mu m}$ vs. $f_{8\mu m}/f_{5.8\mu m}$ diagram, are affected by the exclusion of E/S0 galaxies in our current models. Also the NIR spectral features considered by Simpson and Eisenhardt (1999), e.g. the $1.6\mu m$ H^- opacity minimum and the $2.3\mu m$ CO bandhead, are not considered in our SED model (Section 2), therefore the changes in the IRAC colors due to the K-correction caused by these features are absent in our model predictions. Improvements in these aspects will be addressed in our next paper.

6. Discussion

6.1. Comparisons with Previous Models in Literature

6.1.1. Comparisons with Models in Paper I and Paper II

Three new features separate the models presented here from the previous models in Paper I and Paper II:

- (1) An approach even more empirical than that used in Paper I is adopted in this work. Realistic SEDs of local galaxies are attached to sources of all redshifts. This not only enabled reliable K-corrections, but also linked the surveys in different bands coherently. Because of this feature, our model is the first in the literature that can predict the correlations and the dispersions in color-color diagrams for multi-band surveys.
- (2) The MIR-FIR SEDs in the SED sample are extended to a much wider range covering from UV ($1000\text{\AA}$) to radio (20cm). This links the model predictions for IR surveys to the optical and radio continuum surveys. Because of the wide wavelength coverage, our model can calculate the contributions from the IR sources to the cosmic background from optical to radio bands.

- (3) Instead of evolving all IR sources as a single population, they are divided into three populations (normal late-types, starbursts, and galaxies with AGN) which are assumed to evolve differently. Given the observational evidence (Aussel et al. 1999; Elbaz et al. 1999; Flores et al. 1999), most of the evolution is attributed to the starburst (interacting) galaxies.

In Paper II, it was found that a pure luminosity evolution of form $L \propto (1+z)^{4.5}$ ($z \leq 1.5$) can fit the ISOCAM $15\mu m$ surveys and IRAS $60\mu m$ surveys best (both surveys are insensitive to the evolution at $z > 1.5$). This evolution rate is significantly stronger than those derived in previous IRAS studies ($L \propto (1+z)^3$), while at same time it confirms that luminosity evolution models fit the data better than density evolution models (e.g. Pearson and Rowan-Robinson 1996).

In this paper, while assuming that normal late-types and galaxies with AGNs undergo pure luminosity evolution ($L \propto (1+z)^{1.5}$ and $L \propto (1+z)^{3.5}$, respectively), we found that a model assuming that both the luminosity and the density of starburst galaxies evolve significantly ($L \propto (1+z)^{4.2}$ and $\rho \propto (1+z)^2$) before the turn-over redshift ($z=1.5$), fits the data best. A model with more luminosity evolution and less density evolution ($L \propto (1+z)^5$ and $\rho \propto (1+z)$) predicted a peak in the Euclidean normalized differential counts at $15\mu m$ too shallow and too bright compared to the data (fig.7c). Another model with less luminosity evolution and more density evolution ($L \propto (1+z)^{3.5}$ and $\rho \propto (1+z)^3$), while fitting well the $15\mu m$ counts, predicted too much IR background (fig.7d and Fig.8a).

The prediction of our best-fit model of a density evolution of starburst galaxies on the order of $(1+z)^2$ is consistent with the theoretical prediction (Carlberg et al. 1994) and with previous observations (Infante et al. 1996; Roche and Eales 1999; Le Fèvre et al. 2000) of the evolution of merger rate. It is also very consistent with the close relation between starbursts and galaxy interactions/mergers (see Sanders and Mirabel 1996 for a review).

The constraints on the evolution of IR sources at $z > 1.5$ are set by the CIB and the $850\mu m$ SCUBA counts. Because of the negative K-correction, high redshift galaxies contribute significantly to the source counts and the cosmic background in the submm bands. It is found that in order to avoid over-predicting the CIB and the SCUBA counts, a steep decrease after $z=1.5$, in the form of $(1+z)^{-3}$, in the evolution of IR sources is required. This is different from the result in Paper II, where the ‘Flat Model’ (luminosity and density remain constant after $z=1.5$) can fit the CIB satisfactorily (Fig.7 of Paper II). This is due to the difference in the submm SEDs adopted in these two papers. In Paper II a single template for the submm SEDs is adopted for all sources, specified by $T=40K$ and $\beta = 1.5$ (Blain et al. 1999). In this paper, the

submm SEDs are determined using empirical correlations between IRAS fluxes and the submm fluxes. This results in a higher submm luminosity for a given MIR luminosity ($L_{24\mu m}$). Since little is known about the IR-submm SEDs of high z sources, and we cannot test our assumption that the correlations between the IR and submm fluxes of local galaxies can be applied to high z galaxies, the rapid decrease of the SFR predicted by our best-fit model is highly uncertain.

Because of the steep decrease after $z=1.5$, our best-fit model predicts a redshift distribution with a single peak at $z \sim 1$ for a survey with $f_{24\mu m} = 0.055 mJy$ ($5\sigma_{conf}$). This is very different from the double peaked distribution predicted by the ‘Flat Model’ (Fig.19, see also Fig.14c of Paper I). This provides a straightforward test to distinguish these models once the redshifts of a sample of SIRTf $24\mu m$ sources are obtained.

6.1.2. Comparisons with Roche and Eales (1999)

In the multi-IR-band model of Roche and Eales (1999), a density evolution of $\rho \propto (1+z)^2$ is also assumed. However, the luminosity evolutionary rate of starburst galaxies found by Roche and Eales (1999), $L \propto (1+z)^2$ ($z < 1$), is significantly weaker than predicted by our best-fit model: $L \propto (1+z)^{4.2}$ ($z < 1.5$).

6.1.3. Comparisons with Dole et al. (2000)

Compared to the other two populations (normal late-types and galaxies with AGNs), our best-fit model predicts much stronger evolution for $z < 1.5$ in the starburst galaxies population. This is similar to the model of Dole et al. (2000). However, they confine their starburst component, called ‘ULIRGs’, to galaxies with $> 2 \times 10^{11} L_{\odot}$. In order to fit the ISO counts they have to evolve the ‘ULIRG’ population significantly, resulting in a ‘break’ in the evolved luminosity function at $z=2.5$ (Fig.3a of Dole et al. 2000). In Fig.22, the evolved luminosity functions predicted by our best-fit model are plotted. At $z \geq 1$, the starburst component dominates the LF in the whole luminosity range (10^7 – 10^{12}). Our model does not predict a break such as presented in the model of Dole et al. (2000).

6.1.4. Comparisons with Blain et al. (1999)

Blain et al. (1999) used IRAS $60\mu m$ counts, early results of ISO $175\mu m$ counts, SCUBA $850\mu m$ counts, and the CIB to constrain several families of models for the evolution of IR sources. Since different cosmologies are used ($\Omega_m = 0.3$, $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.7$ in this work, $\Omega_m = 1$, $\Omega_\Lambda = 0$ in Blain et al. 1999), it is difficult to make a quantitative comparison. In the three panels in Fig.23, we plot the cosmic luminosity density evolution from our best-fit model. In the upper panel, the MIR luminosity density, calculated using the parameters of the best-fit model, is plotted versus the time since the Big-Bang (in fraction of the age of the Universe t_0). In the middle panel, the density of bolometric luminosity ($0.1 - 1000 \mu m$) obtained from a simulation ($f_{24\mu m} > 10^{-9} mJy$, 0.01 deg^2) based on the best-fit model is plotted. In the lower panel, results for the density of IR luminosity ($3 - 1000 \mu m$) from the same simulation is plotted. For IR sources, the IR luminosity density is proportional to the star formation rate per unit cosmic comoving volume.

Comparing the lower panel of Fig.23 with Fig.9 of Blain et al., our best-fit model is closer to their 'Peak-Models' (rise—peak—drop) than the 'Anvil-Models' (rise—peak—flat). As pointed out by Blain et al. (1999), if indeed the contributions from AGNs to the CIB and to the submm counts are negligible, the 'Peak-Models' are favored because the 'Anvil-Models' may over predict the metal contents of the Universe.

6.1.5. Comparisons with Rowan-Robinson (2001)

Recently Rowan-Robinson (2001, hereafter RR01) developed a model to study the evolution of galaxies using multi-band IR surveys. This goal is similar to that which motivated this paper. Consequently, there are many similarities between RR01 and the work presented here.

- (1) Strategy: Both RR01 and we use all the available surveys to constrain the evolution, then use the best-fit model to make predictions for future surveys.
- (2) Methodology: Both RR01 and we use local SEDs to link all surveys together, though RR01 started from the IRAS $60\mu m$ band and we started from IRAS $25\mu m$ band.
- (3) Results: Both the models of RR01 and of this paper can fit all ISO surveys, SCUBA $850\mu m$ surveys, and the CIB.
- (4) These agreements are the natural consequence of the fact that in both papers the model parameters are tuned to fit the counts in these bands. In Fig.24a, a comparison between the model predictions on

the cosmic luminosity density evolution by RR01 (the model for $\Lambda = 0.7$, dot-dot-dot-dashed curve) and by our best-fit model (‘Peak Model’, solid curve) are plotted. Though the function forms are different, the overall trends are quite similar.

On the other hand, there are some major differences between RR01 and this paper:

- 1) Assumptions: RR01 assumed that all the IR sources in his model, which he decomposed into four spectral components (cirrus, M82-like starburst, Arp220-like starburst, and AGN dust torus), evolve as a single population. We have assumed that the three populations (normal late-types, starbursts, and galaxies with AGNs) in our model evolve differently. RR01 also adopted a different functional form (exponential) to describe the evolution, while the evolution functions in this paper are simple power-laws.
- 2) SEDs: We have used 800+ empirically determined SEDs, which are binned according to population and luminosity, to constrain the K-corrections and the links between counts in different bands. This is more sophisticated than the approach of RR01, where four theoretical SEDs taken from the literature (Efsthathiou et al. 2000b; Yoshii and Takahara 1988) are adopted for the four populations, respectively.
- 3) Evolution of SEDs: In RR01 models, the SEDs of IR sources undergoing luminosity evolution do not evolve. This is different from our assumption for the luminosity dependence of SEDs, namely when the luminosity of the IR sources evolves, the SED changes with the luminosity (see Section 6.3).
- 4) Predictions for redshift distribution of SIRTf sources: In Fig.24 we compare the redshift distribution of sources in the SIRTf $70\mu m$ band ($f_{70\mu m} \geq 5$ mJy) predicted by RR01 and by our best-fit model. While RR01 predict that most of these sources (‘cirrus’ and starbursts) have $z < 0.5$ (median ~ 0.4), our best-fit model predicts the opposite, namely most of sources (starbursts) have $z > 0.5$ (median ~ 1). This difference is mainly due to the different evolution rates of normal-spirals (‘cirrus galaxies’) in the two models: In our best-fit model, the evolution rate of the normals is rather low (evolution index = 1.5). Since the normals dominate sources in the local Universe, the evolution rate of overall IR sources at low z is low in our best-fit model. Only when the starbursts overtake the normals as the dominant population, which occurs at $z \sim 0.5$, does the high evolution rate of the starbursts start to significantly affect the IR sources on the whole. On the other hand, in RR01, all populations evolve with the same rate. So the evolution index is ~ 3 at small redshifts for normal spirals. Consequently, as shown in the upper panel of Fig.23, the star formation rate (roughly

proportional to the luminosity density) of RR01 is about a factor of 2 higher than our best-fit model at $z < 0.5$. The SFR predicted by our best-fit model starts to catch up with RR01 at larger z and then overshoots until $z \sim 1.5$. It follows that a redshift survey of SIRTf sources in the $70\mu m$ band will serve as a good test to distinguish the models. It should be noted that for the sample of faint IRAS $60\mu m$ sources ($f_{60\mu m} \geq 200$ mJy, Oliver et al. 1996), our best-fit model predicts too many (about a factor of 10) sources with $z > 0.4$ compared to the observations (6 out of 1400: Rowan-Robinson, private communication). However, it is not very clear to what extent the discrepancy is due to biases introduced by large scale structures and by the incompleteness of the redshift survey (see the end of Section 4). RR01, which predicts about a factor of 2 less such sources than our best-fit model, gives a better fit to the redshift data.

- 5) CIB: The difference in the evolution rates in different populations between RR01 and our best-fit model results in a significant discrepancy on the relative contributions from different populations to the counts and to the CIB. As shown in Fig.25, our model predicts that the IR-submm CIB is predominantly due to the starburst galaxies. The best-fit model of RR01 predicts that most of the CIB is due to ‘cirrus galaxies’ (close to ‘normals’ in our model) which, because they are assumed to evolve as strongly as starburst galaxies, maintain their dominance to the IR emission from the local Universe throughout the high- z Universe. Both of our models predict negligible contributions from AGNs to the CIB ($< 10\%$ at any given wavelength), although the ‘starburst’ model populations could include a significant heavily obscured segment of the AGN population that are thought to contribute significantly to the Cosmic X-ray Background (XRB; eg. Gilli, Salvati and Hasinger 2001).

6.2. Star Formation History

Much attention has been attracted since Madau et al. (1996) related source counts and redshift distributions obtained from deep UV/optical surveys to the star-formation/metal-production history of the Universe. Since then the so-called “Madau-Diagram” has been revised many times through various improvements, including (1) the corrections for the effect of dust extinction on UV/optical luminosities (Madau et al. 1998; Pozzetti et al. 1998; Steidel et al. 1999), (2) results from less extinction sensitive Balmer line surveys (Gallego et al. 1995; Tresse and Maddox 1998; Yan et al. 1999; Glazebrook et al. 1999), (3) results from submm SCUBA surveys (Barger et al. 1999).

Adopting the conversion factor of Kennicutt (1999), $SFR (M_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}) = L_{IR} \times 4.5 \cdot 10^{-44} (\text{erg s}^{-1})$, we

convert the IR (3–1000 μm) luminosity density curve plotted in Fig.23 (lower panel) to a star formation rate curve. In Fig.26 the result is compared with the survey data found in the literature. Not surprisingly, the model prediction is in very good agreement with the results from ISOCAM surveys (Flores et al. 1999) because at $z < 1.5$ the model is constrained by the ISOCAM data. On the other hand, the model prediction is slightly higher than the results of the UV/optical and H α surveys of $z < 1.5$. After the turn-over redshift, our best-fit model predicts a quick decrease, similar to what have been suggested by the UV data of Lyman-break galaxies.

The ‘Flat Model’, represented by the dashed line, predicts too much CIB (Fig.9) and too many counts in the SCUBA 850 μm band (Fig.10). The SFR of $z \gtrsim 3$ galaxies predicted by the ‘Flat Model’ is about a factor of 7 higher than those derived from the UV data of Lyman-break galaxies, even after the UV data are corrected for the extinction (about a factor of 3, Steidel et al. 1999). Although we can not rule out the ‘Flat Model’ because of the uncertainties associated with the evolution of the submm SEDs, and those associated with the extinction corrections of the UV data, it is certainly disfavored by our results. On the other hand models between the ‘Peak Model’ and the ‘Flat Model’, such as the Model 5 plotted by the dotted line (see also Fig.9), are certainly allowed by our results.

6.3. Uncertainties Introduced by Model Assumptions

The most important assumption in this work concerns the applicability of the SED vs. IR luminosity relation, found for local IR galaxies (Soifer and Neugebauer 1991; Fang et al. 1998), for high z galaxies. Namely we assume that the SEDs do not evolve with time for a given luminosity. Note that this is different from assuming that the SEDs of galaxies do not evolve at all, because our models indeed predict strong luminosity evolution for IR galaxies and therefore, under our assumption, more galaxies in the early epochs have SEDs similar to local luminous IR galaxies which are significantly different from the SEDs of local L_* galaxies.

This assumption is not very well constrained. Not much is known about the IR SEDs of high z galaxies, in particular no current FIR ($\lambda \gtrsim 30\mu m$) instrument is sensitive enough to detect them in the FIR bands. A few $z \gtrsim 1$ galaxies have been identified in the ISOCAM surveys (predominantly in ISOCAM 15 μm surveys, Aussel et al. et al. 1999; Flores et al. 1999), and the optical SEDs of some of them have been obtained using HST images (Flores et al. 1999). The submm SCUBA surveys (Hughes et al. 1998; Barger et al. 1998; Blain et al. 1999) may have detected quite a few high z galaxies. But the positional uncertainties of

the SCUBA sources are so large that it is very difficult to make cross identifications in other bands. In fact so far only a handful (3 – 5, Frayer: private communication) high z SCUBA sources have published high confidence optical identifications and redshifts (Ivison et al. 1998; Barger et al. 1999; Frayer et al. 1999a). The most recent results of Ivison et al. (2000) show that indeed the SEDs of these galaxies have similar shapes to local ULIRGs such as Arp 220 or Mrk 231.

High- z galaxies seen in deep surveys are high luminosity galaxies. Thus, to the extent that they have similar SEDs to their local counterparts, our results will be valid. Namely, intrinsically *faint* galaxies at high z may have different SEDs than their local counterparts, but this won't have any significant effect on the predictions for number counts and the CIB. It is likely that in high z ULIRGs the luminosities in all bands are predominantly radiated in localized starburst regions and/or AGNs, where the physical processes determining the luminosity and the SED (e.g. AGN related processes, star formation, radiative transfer, etc.) are similar to those in local ULIRGs. In particular, both the theoretical arguments and observational evidence (Soifer et al. 1998; Armus et al. 1998) show that dust is produced rapidly after the first star formation episode in galaxies. Therefore those high luminosity galactic nuclei in the early Universe are likely to be optically thick (Soifer et al. 1998; Armus et al. 1998), similar to their local counterparts.

It is expected that for large samples of galaxies SEDs covering $4000\text{\AA}$ — $160\mu m$ will be available when SIRTf deep surveys and follow-up optical/NIR surveys are carried out. Then the assumption that the SED vs. IR luminosity relation of local IR galaxies also holds for high z galaxies will be fully tested.

Throughout this paper, we have assumed the Λ cosmology ($\Omega_\Lambda = 0.7$, $\Omega_m = 0.3$), which is favored by recent observations of type I supernovae in distant galaxies (Perlmutter et al. 1997; Garnavich et al. 1998). Compared to the standard $\Omega_\Lambda = 0$, $\Omega_m = 1$ Einstein-de Sitter cosmology, the co-moving volume corresponding to a given z is significantly larger in the Λ cosmology (Carroll et al. 1992). Although this volume factor is partially balanced by relatively fainter flux for a given luminosity and given z in the Λ cosmology, it still affects significantly the predictions of the SCUBA counts and the submm CIB, where the contribution from high z sources is large. This is one of the reasons why a steep decrease after $z=1.5$ is favored by our best-fit model (Fig.26). If the Einstein-de Sitter cosmology were adopted, a flatter SFR at early epochs would have been obtained.

The assumptions for the evolution rates of normal late-type galaxies and of galaxies with AGNs (Section 3.3) are based on the results of optical and NIR surveys of these sources. Whether they also apply to the IR bands will have to be tested with future IR surveys (e.g. SIRTf surveys). Nevertheless, if indeed

most of the evolution in IR bright galaxies is due to starburst galaxies (and possibly also highly obscured AGN), as suggested by ISOCAM surveys (Elbaz et al. 1999; Flores et al. 1999), these uncertainties will have minimal effects on our results for the overall IR evolution.

Finally, the prominent peak at $z = 1.5$ in the SFR v.s. redshift plot (Fig.25) is an artifact due to the simple two-step power-law function form adopted for the evolution functions (Eq(7) and Eq(8)). However the SFR at $z < 1.5$ is mostly constrained by the ISOCAM $15\mu m$ surveys, which indeed reach as deep as $z=1.5$. As was argued in Paper II, a very strong evolution all the way back to $z \sim 1.5$ is needed to explain the sharp peak at $f_{15\mu m} \sim 0.4$ mJy in the Euclidean normalized differential $15\mu m$ counts (Elbaz 1999).

7. Conclusions

We have developed empirical ‘backward-evolution’ models for multiband IR surveys. A new Monte-Carlo algorithm is developed for this task. It exploits a large library consisting of realistic Spectral Energy Distributions (SEDs) of 837 local IR galaxies (IRAS $25\mu m$ selected) from the UV ($1000\text{\AA}$) to the radio (20cm), including ISO-measured 3– $13\mu m$ unidentified broad features (UIBs). The basic assumption is that the local correlation between SEDs and Mid-Infrared (MIR) luminosities can be applied to earlier epochs of the Universe. A Λ -Cosmology ($\Omega_\Lambda = 0.7$, $\Omega_m = 0.3$) has been assumed through out the paper. By attaching an SED appropriately drawn from the SED library to every source predicted by a given model, the algorithm enables simultaneous comparisons with multiple surveys in a wide range of wavebands.

IR galaxies are divided into three populations: (1) normal late type galaxies (‘normals’), (2) starburst/interacting galaxies (‘starbursts’), and galaxies with AGNs (‘AGNs’). Different cosmic evolution is assumed for these different populations. Parameterized (power-law) luminosity evolution functions ($F_i(z)$) and density evolution functions ($G_i(z)$) of the form

$$\begin{aligned} F_i(z) &= (1+z)^{u_i} \quad (z \leq z_1) \\ &= (1+z)^{v_i} \quad (z_1 < z \leq z_0) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} G_i(z) &= (1+z)^{p_i} \quad (z \leq z_1) \\ &= (1+z)^{q_i} \quad (z_1 < z \leq z_0) \end{aligned}$$

are adopted, with $z_1 = 1.5$ and $z_0 = 7$. At $z < 1.5$, for ‘normals’ ($i=1$) and ‘AGNs’ ($i=3$) it is assumed $u_1 = 1.5$ $p_1 = 0$ (passive luminosity evolution) and $u_3 = 3.5$ $p_3 = 0$ (evolution rate of optical QSOs),

respectively. The evolution rate of ‘starbursts’ ($i=2$) at $z < 1.5$ is determined by fitting the ISOCAM $15\mu m$ surveys. The best fit results are $u_2 = 4.2$ $p_2 = 2$. At $1.5 \leq z \leq 7$, the evolution of IR galaxies is mostly constrained by the submm counts and the CIB. It is found that a ‘Peak Model’, with the p_i and u_i values described above and $v_1 = v_2 = v_3 = q_2 = -3$, gives the best fit. The ‘Flat Model’, which is the same as the ‘Peak Model’ at $z < 1.5$ but $v_1 = v_2 = v_3 = q_2 = 0$ at $1.5 \leq z \leq 7$, over-predicts significantly the SCUBA counts and the CIB.

Remarkably, the best-fit model (‘Peak Model’) gives good fits simultaneously to all data (both number counts and redshift distributions) obtained from IR surveys, including ISOCAM $15\mu m$, ISOPHOT $90\mu m$, $175\mu m$, IRAS $60\mu m$, and SCUBA $850\mu m$. Predictions for contributions of IR-bright sources to counts in other wavebands, such as the optical B band, the NIR K band, and the radio continuum 20cm band, are also in agreement with the literature. This suggests that the model is robust.

Predictions for number counts, confusion limits, redshift distributions, and color-color diagrams are made for multiband surveys using the upcoming SIRTf satellite. It is found that several SIRTf colors can be useful indicators of galaxy populations and redshifts.

Appendix

A. Correlations between Flux Densities in the FIR and Submm Bands

In this appendix, empirical correlations between flux densities in the IRAS $60\mu m$ and $100\mu m$ bands and in the submm bands at $170\mu m$, $240\mu m$, $450\mu m$, $850\mu m$, and $1200\mu m$ are studied. The results have been applied to the SED model in order to extend the SEDs to the submm (up to $1200\mu m$) wavebands (Section 2).

Flux densities in the submm wavebands were collected from the literature. In the $170\mu m$ band

(including all data between the $160\mu m$ and $180\mu m$ bands), data for 29 galaxies were found in Devereux and Young (1992), Engargiola (1991), Klaas et al. (1997), Hippelein et al. (1996), and Stickel et al. (1998). In the $240\mu m$ band, flux densities were found for 20 galaxies (including 14 upper limits) in Odenwald et al. (1998). In the $450\mu m$ band, 16 detections and 7 upper limits were found in Rigopoulou et al. (1996), Frayer et al. (1999b), Eales et al. (1989), Dunne et al. (2000), and Alton et al. (1998). In the $850\mu m$ band (including also $800\mu m$ band), 121 flux densities (including 1 upper limit) were found in Lisenfeld et al. (2000), Dunne et al. (2000), Alton et al. (1998), Rigopoulou et al. (1996), Hughes et al. (1990), Frayer et al. (1999b), Eales et al. (1989). In the $1200\mu m$ band (including all observations between the $1000\mu m$ and $1300\mu m$ bands), 62 detections and 4 upper limits were found in Andreani and Franceschini (1996), Rigopoulou et al. (1996), Hughes et al. (1990), Eales et al. (1989), Chini et al. (1986), Fich and Hodge (1993). Color-color diagrams of $\log(f_{submm,i}/f_{100\mu m})$ versus $\log(f_{100\mu m}/f_{60\mu m})$, where $f_{submm,i}$ is one of the submm flux densities listed above, are plotted in Fig.27 — Fig.32. In Fig.31 and Fig.32, color-color diagrams of $\log(f_{1200\mu m}/f_{100\mu m})$ versus $\log(f_{100\mu m}/f_{60\mu m})$ are plotted for the same sources, with the sources in the list of Andreani and Franceschini (1996) (19 sources) being aperture corrected in two different ways as given in Andreani and Franceschini (1996), respectively. Linear relations in the form of

$$\log(f_{submm,i}/f_{100\mu m}) = A_i + B_i \times \log(f_{100\mu m}/f_{60\mu m}) \quad (A1)$$

were derived (eyeball) from these color-color diagrams. In Table A1, the resulting A_i and B_i are listed. For a given source (with detected IRAS flux densities $f_{60\mu m}$ and $f_{100\mu m}$) in the SED sample, the submm flux density in any of the given bands is then estimated using the relation:

$$\log(f_{submm,i}) = \log(f_{100\mu m}) + A_i + B_i \times \log(f_{100\mu m}/f_{60\mu m}). \quad (A2)$$

It should be noted that the correlations plotted in the FIR/submm color-color diagrams are generally rather poor. There are often only a small number of sources in a plot, and many of them are upperlimits. The data are also very heterogeneous, obtained from observations with widely different apertures. Aperture corrections were included only when available in the literature. When there are more than one observations for a given source in a given band, the data from the observation with the largest aperture is taken. Consequently, the lines in the color-color plots which represent our best (eyeball) estimates of the $\log(f_{submm,i}/f_{100\mu m})$ versus $\log(f_{100\mu m}/f_{60\mu m})$ relations are very uncertain. This reflects the true situation in the current literature of extragalactic submm sources. Nevertheless, it appears that the submm SEDs derived using flux densities predicted by these relations agree well with the observations for a wide variety of extragalactic sources (Fig.2). And the good agreement between the simulated and measured $850\mu m$ and

1.2mm luminosity functions (Fig.5 and Fig.6) further support the validity of these empirical relations. We have deliberately avoided any modelling in deriving the relations, keeping them purely empirical. They will set constraints to theoretical models of dust heating in galaxies (e.g. Silva et al. 1998; Dale et al. 2001; Popescu et al. 2000).

Glenn Morrison is acknowledged for help in collecting the VLA data. George Rieke is thanked for pointing out a computational error in a previous version of this paper. Helpful comments from Andrew Blain, George Helou, Rob Ivison, Tom Soifer, and an anonymous referee are acknowledged. This research has made use of the NASA/IPAC Extragalactic Database (NED) which is operated by the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, under contract with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. This work has made use of data products from the Two Micron All Sky Survey (2MASS), which is a joint project of the University of Massachusetts and the Infrared Processing and Analysis Center/California Institute of Technology, funded by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the National Science Foundation. This work has made use of data services of the InfraRed Science Archive (IRSA) at the Infrared Processing and Analysis Center/California Institute of Technology, funded by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. This work has also made use of data products from the NRAO VLA Sky Survey (NVSS) and the Faint Images of the Radio Sky at Twenty-cm (FIRST), both are NRAO projects carried out using the NRAO Very Large Array (VLA). The authors were supported by the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, under contract with NASA.

REFERENCES

- Adelberger, K.L, Steidel, C.C. 2000, ApJ, 544, 218.
- Alton, P.B., Bianchi, S., Rand, R.J., Xilouris, E.M., Davies, J.I., Trewhella, M. 1998, ApJ, 507, L125.
- Andreani, P., Franceschini, A. 1996, MNRAS, 283, 85.
- Armus, L., Matthews, K., Neugebauer, G., Soifer, B.T. 1998, ApJL, 506, 89.
- Aussel, H., Cesarsky, C.J., Elbaz, D., Starck, J.L. 1999, A&A, 342, 313.
- Barger, A.J., Cowie, L.L., Sanders, D.B., et al. 1998, Nature, 394, 248.
- Barger, A.J., Cowie, L.L., Sanders, D.B., et al. 1999, ApJ, 518, L5.
- Becker, R.H., White, R.L., Helfand, D.J. 1995, ApJ, 450, 559.
- Benford, D. 1999, Ph.D. Dissertation, Caltech.
- Bershady, M.A., Lowenthal, J.D., Koo, D.C. 1998, ApJ, 505, 50.
- Bertin, E., Dennefeld, M., Moshir, M. 1997, A&A, 323, 685.
- Bicay, M.D., Beichman, C.A., Cutri, R.M., Madore, B.F. 1999, “Astrophysics with Infrared Surveys: A Prelude to SIRTf”, ASP Conf. Series, vol. 177, ASP (San Francisco).
- Blain, A.W., Smail, I., Ivison, R.J., Kneib, J.-P. 1999, MNRAS, 302, 632.
- Blain, A.W., Smail, I., Ivison, R.J., Kneib, J.-P., 2000, in ‘The Hy-Redshift Universe: galaxy formation and evolution at high redshift’, eds. A. J. Bunker & W. J. M. van Breughel, ASP conference vol. 193, ASP: San Francisco, p. 246.
- Boyle, B.J., Shank, T., Peterson, B.A. 1988, MNRAS, 235, 935.
- Carico, D.P., Keene, J., Soifer, B.T., Neugebauer, G. 1992, PASP 104, 1086.
- Carlberg, R. G., Pritchet, C. J. & Infante, L. 1994, ApJ, 435, 540.
- Carroll, S.M., Press, W., Turner, E. 1992, ARA&A, 30, 499.
- Ciliegi, P., McMahon, R. G., Miley, G., Gruppioni, C., et al. 1999, MNRAS, 302, 222.
- Chini, R., Kruegel, E., Kreysa, E. 1986, A&A, 166, L8.
- Clavel, J., Schulz, B., Altieri, B., Barr, P., Claes, P., Heras, A., Leech, K., Metcalfe, L., Salama, A. 2000, A&A, 357, 839.

- Clements, D. L., Desert, F.-X., Franceschini, A., Reach, W. T., Baker, A. C., Davies, J. K., & Cesarsky, C. 1999, A&A 346, 383.
- Connolly, A.J., Szalay, A.S., Dickinson, M., SubbaRao, M.U., & Brunner, R.J. 1997, ApJ, 486, L11.
- Condon, J.J. 1984, ApJ, 284, 44.
- Condon J.J., Cotton, W.D., Greusen, E.W. et al. 1998, AJ, 115, 1693.
- Condon, J.J., Helou, G., Sanders, D. B., Soifer, B.T. 1990, ApJS, 73, 359.
- Dale, D.A., Helou, G., Contursi, A., Silbermann, N.A., Sonali, K. 2001, ApJ, 549, 215.
- Devereux, N.A., Young, J.S. 1992, AJ, 103, 1536.
- Dickinson, M., et al. 2001, <http://www.stsci.edu/science/goods>.
- Dole, H., Lagache, G., Puget, J-L., et al. 2000, astro-ph/0002283.
- Dole, H., Gispert, R., Lagache, G., Puget, J-L., et al. 2001, A&A, 372, 364.
- Driver, S.P., Windhorst, R.A., Osterander, E.J., et al. 1995, ApJ, 449, L23.
- Dunne, L., Eales, S., Edmunds, M., Ivison, R., Alexander, P., Clements, D.L. 2000, MNRAS, 315, 115.
- Dwek, E., Arendt, R.G. 1998, ApJ, 508, L9.
- Dwek, E., Arendt, R.G., Hauser, M.G., et al. 1998, ApJ, 508, 106.
- Dwek, E., Slavin, J. 1994, ApJ, 436, 696.
- Eales, S.A., Wynn-Williams, C.G., Duncan, W.D. 1989, ApJ 339, 859.
- Efstathiou, A., Oliver, S., Rowan-Robinson, M., Surace, C., et al. 2000a, MNRAS, 319, 1169.
- Efstathiou, A., Rowan-Robinson, Siebenmorgen, R. 2000b, MNRAS, 313, 734.
- Elbaz, D., Aussel, H., Baker, A.C., et al. 1998a, The Next Generation Space Telescope: Science Drivers and Technological Challenges, 34th Liege Astrophysics Colloquium, p. 47.
- Elbaz, D., Aussel, H., Cesarsky, C.J., et al. 1998b, in *The Universe as Seen by ISO*, eds. P. Cox & M.F. Kessler, p999.
- Elbaz, D., Cesarsky, C.J., Fadda, D. , et al. 1999, A&A, 351, L37.
- Engargiola, G. 1991, ApJS, 76, 875
- Fang, F., Shupe, D. L., Xu, C., and Hacking, P. B. 1998, ApJ, 500, 693.

- Fich, M. Hodge, P. 1993, *AJ*, 415, 75.
- Finkbeiner, D.P., Davis, M., Schlegel, D.J. 2000, *ApJ*, 544, 81.
- Fixsen, D.J., Dwek, E., Mather, J.C., Bennett, C.L., Shafer, R.A. 1998, *ApJ*, 508, 123.
- Flores, H., Hammer, F., Thuan, T.X., Cesarsky, C., Desert, F.X., et al. 1999, *ApJ*, 517, 148.
- Franceschini, A., Andreani, P., Danese, G. 1998, *MNRAS*, 296, 709.
- Franceschini, A., Danese, L., De Zotti, G., Xu, C. 1988, *MNRAS*, 233, 175.
- Frayser D.T., Ivison, R.J., Scoville, N.Z., et al. 1999a, *ApJ*, 514, L13.
- Frayser D.T., Ivison, R.J., Smail, I., Yun, M.S. Armus, L. 1999b, *AJ* 118, 139.
- Gallego, J., Zamorano, J., Aragon-Salamanca, A., Rego, M. 1995, *ApJ*, 455, L1.
- Gardner, J. P., Sharples, R. M., Carrasco, B. E.. Frenk, C. S. 1996, *MNRAS*, 282, L1.
- Gardner, J. P., Sharples, R. M., Carrasco, B. E.. Frenk, C. S. 1997, *ApJ*, 480, L99.
- Garnavich, P.M., Jha, S., Challis, P. et al. 1998, *ApJ*, 509, 74.
- Gautier, T.N., III, Boulanger, F., Perault, M., Puget, J.L. 1992, *AJ*, 103, 1313.
- Gilli, R., Salvati, M. and Hasinger, G. 2001, *A&A*, 366, 407.
- Glazebrook, K., Blake, C., Economou, F., Lilly, S., Colless, M. 1999, *MNRAS*, 306, 843.
- Glazebrook, K., Ellis, R., Santiago, B., Griffiths, R. 1995, *MNRAS*, 275, L19.
- Gorjian, V., Wright, E.L., Chary, R.R. *ApJ*, 536, 550.
- Gregorich, D.T., Neugebauer, G., Soifer, B.T., Gunn, J.E., Herter, T.L. 1995, *AJ*, 110, 259.
- de Grijp, M.H.K., Miley, K.K., Lub, J., and de Jong, T. 1985, *Nature*, 314, 240.
- Hacking, P. B., Condon, J. J., and Houck, J. R. 1987, *ApJ*, 316, L15.
- Hacking, P., Houck, J.R. 1987, *ApJS*, 63, 311.
- Hacking, P.B., Soifer, B.T. 1991, *ApJL*, 367, 49.
- Hauser, M. G., Arendt, R. G., Kelsall, T., et al. 1998, *ApJ*, 508, 25.
- Helou, G. 1986, *ApJ*, 311, L33.
- Helou, G. Beichman, C.A. 1990, in *From Ground-Based to Space-Borne Sub-mm Astronomy*, Proc. 29th Liège International Astrophysical Colloquium, ESA SP-314, p117.

- Helou, G., Lu, N.Y., Werner, M.W., Malhotra, S., Silbermann, N., 2000, *ApJ*, 532, L21.
- Hippelein, H., Lemke, D., Tuffs, R.J., Hass, M., et al. 1996, *A&A* 315, L79.
- Huang, J.-S., Cowie, L., Luppino, G. 1998, *ApJ*, 396, 31.
- Hughes, D.H., Gear, W.K., Robson, E.I. 1990, *MNRAS* 244, 759.
- Hughes, D.H., Serjeant, S., Dunlop, J., et al. 1998, *Nature*, 394, 241.
- Infante, L., de Mello, Du F., Menanteau, F. 1996, *ApJ*, 469, L85.
- Ivison, R., Smail, I., Le Borgne, J.-F., et al. 1998, *MNRAS*, 298, 583.
- Ivison, R., Smail, I., Barger, A.J., et al. 2000, *MNRAS*, 315, 209.
- Kawara, K., Sato, Y., Matsuhara, H., et al. 1998, *A&A*, 336, L9.
- Kessler, M.F., Steinz, J.A., Anderegg, M.E. et al. 1996, *A&A*, **315**, L27.
- Kennicutt, R. C., 1999, *ApJ*, 525, 1165
- Klaas, U., Haas M., Heinrichsen I., Schulz B. 1997, *A&A*, 325, L21.
- La Franca, F., Matute, I., Gruppioni, C., Alexander, D. et al. 2000, to appear in the proceedings of the Fourth Italian Conference on AGNs (MemSAIt) (astro-ph/0006177).
- Lagache, G., Albergel, A., Boulanger, F., Puget, J.-L. Puget 1998, *A&A*, 333, 709.
- Le Fèvre, O., Abraham, R., Lilly, S.J., Ellis, R.S., et al. 2000, *MNRAS*, 311, 565.
- Lilly, S.J., Le Fèvre, O., Hammer, F., Crampton, D. 1996, *ApJ*, 460, L1.
- Lisenfeld, U., Isaak, K.G., Hills, R. 2000, *MNRAS*, 312, 433.
- Lonsdale, C.J. 2000, in *Astrophysics with Infrared Surveys: A Prelude to SIRTf*, ASPC Series **177**, eds. M.D. Bica, C.A. Beichman, R.M. Cutri, and B.F. Madore, p24.
- Lonsdale, C.J., Hacking, P.B. 1989, *ApJ*, 339, L712.
- Lonsdale, C.J., Hacking, P.B., Conrow, T.B., Rowan-Robinson, M. 1990, *ApJ*, 358, 20.
- Lonsdale, C.J., et al. 2001, <http://www.ipac.caltech.edu/SWIRE/>
- Madau, P., Ferguson, H.C., Dickinson, M., Giavalisco, M., et al. 1996, *MNRAS*, 283, 1388.
- Madau, P., Pozzetti, L., Dickinson, M. 1998, *ApJ*, 498, 106.
- Malkan, M.A., Stecker, F.W. 1998, *ApJ*, 496, 13.

- Metcalfe, N., Shanks, T., Fong, R., Jones, L.R. 1991, MNRAS, 249, 498.
- Metcalfe, N., Shanks, T., Fong, R., Roche, N. 1995, MNRAS, 273, 257.
- Minezaki, T., Kobayashi, Y., Yoshii, Y., Peterson, B.A. 1998, ApJ, 494, 111.
- Niklas, S., Klein, U., Braine, J., Wielebinski, R. 1995, A&AS, 114, 21.
- Niklas, S., Klein, U., Wielebinski, R. 1997, A&A, 322, 19.
- Odenwald, S. Newmark, J., Smoot, G. 1998, ApJ 500, 554.
- Oliver, S.J., Rowan-Robinson, M., Broadhurst, T.J., et al. 1996, MNRAS, 280, 673.
- Oliver, S., Rowan-Robinson, M., Alexander, D.M., et al. 2000, MNRAS, 316, 749.
- Pearson, C., and Rowan-Robinson, M. 1996, MNRAS, 283, 174.
- Pei, Y.C. 1995, ApJ, 438, 623.
- Perlmutter, S., Gabi, S., Goldhaber, G., et al. 1997, ApJ, 483, 565.
- Popescu, C.C., Misiriotis, A., Kylafis, N.D., Tuffs, R.J., Fischera, J. 2000, A&A, 362, 138.
- Pozzetti, L., Madau, P., Zamorani, G., Ferguson, H.C., Bruzual, G. 1998, MNRAS, 298, 1133.
- Puget, J-L., Albergel, A., Boulanger, F., et al. 1996 A&A, 308, L5.
- Puget, J-L., Lagache, G., Clements, D.L, et al. 1999, A&A, 345, 29.
- Puget, J.L., Léger, A., 1989, ARA&A, 27, 161.
- Richards, E. A., Fomalont, E. B., Kellermann, K. I., Windhorst, R. A., Partridge, R. B., Cowie, L. L., Barger, A. J. 1999, ApJ, 526, 73.
- Rigopoulou, D., Lawrence, A., and Rowan-Robinson, M. 1996, MNRAS, 278, 1049.
- Roche, P. F., Chandler, C. J. 1993, MNRAS 265, 486.
- Roche, N., Eales, S.A. 1999, MNRAS, 307, 111.
- Rowan-Robinson, M. 2001, ApJ, in press (astro-ph/0012022, RR01).
- Rowan-Robinson, M., Hughes, J., Veda, K., Walker, D.W. 1990, MNRAS, 246, 473.
- Rowan-Robinson, M., Mann, R.G., Oliver, S.J., et al. 1997, MNRAS, 289, 490.
- Rush, B., Malkan, M.A., Spinoglio, L. 1993, ApJS, 89, 1.
- Sanders, D.B., Mirabel, I.F. 1996, ARA&A, 34, 749.

- Saunders, W., Rowan-Robinson, M., Lawrence, A., et al. 1990, MNRAS, 242, 318.
- Serjeant, S., Oliver, S., Rowan-Robinson, M., Crockett, H., et al. 2000, MNRAS, 316, 768.
- Shupe, D.L., Fan, F., Hacking, P.B., Huchra, J.P. 1998, ApJ, 501, 597.
- Silva, L., Granato, G.L., Bressan, A., Danese, L. 1998, ApJ, 509, 103.
- Simpson, C., Eisenhardt, P. 1999, PASP, 111, 691.
- Soifer, B.T., Neugebauer, G. 1991, AJ, 101, 354.
- Soifer, B.T., Matthews, K., Djorgovski, S., Larkin, J., et al. 1994, ApJL, 420, L1.
- Soifer, B.T., Neugebauer, Frank, G. M., Matthews, K., and Illingworth, G. D. 1998, ApJL, 501, 171.
- Spinoglio, L., Malkan, M.A., Rush, B., Carrasco, L., Recillas-Cruz, E. 1995, ApJ, 453, 616.
- Spoon, H.W.W., Koornneef, J., Moorwood, A.F.M., Lutz, D., Tielens, A.G.G.M. 2000, A&A, 357, 898.
- Stickel, M., Bogun, S., Lemke, D., Klaas, U., et al. 1998, A&A, 336, 116.
- Stanev, T., Franceschini, A. 1998, ApJ, 494, L159.
- Steidel, C.C., Adelberger, K., Giavalisco, M., Dickinson, M., Pettini, M., 1999, ApJ, 519, 1
- Trentham, N., Blain, A.W., Goldader, J. 1998, MNRAS, 305, 61.
- Tresse, L., Maddox, S. J. 1998, ApJ, 495, 691.
- Yan, L., McCarthy, P. J., Freudling, W., Teplitz, Harry I., Malumuth, E. M., Weymann, . J., Malkan, M. A. 1999, ApJ, 519, L47.
- Williams, R.E., Blacker, B., Dickinson, M., Van Dyke, W., et al. 1996, AJ, 112, 1335.
- Xu, C., Hacking, P.B., Fan, F., Shupe, D.L., Lonsdale, C.J., Lu, N.Y., Helou, G.X., 1998, ApJ, 508, 576 (Paper I).
- Xu, C., 2000, ApJ, 541, 134 (Paper II).
- Yahil, A., Strauss, M., Davis, M., Huchra, J.P. 1991, ApJ, 372, 380.
- Yoshii, Y., Takahara, F. 1988, ApJ, 326, 1.

Table 1. Bins of SED library

population	[†] $L_{25\mu m}$ bin		number of sources
	$\log(L_1)$	$\log(L_2)$	
Normals	6	8	3
	8	9	81
	9	9.4	65
	9.4	9.8	63
	9.8	10.2	36
	10.2	11	18
Starbursts	6	8	2
	8	9	31
	9	9.4	46
	9.4	9.8	85
	9.8	10.2	80
	10.2	10.6	78
	10.6	11	41
	11	12	16
AGNs	6	10	63
	10	12	129

[†] $L_{25\mu m} = \nu L_\nu(25\mu m)$, in units of $L_\odot$. Luminosity bins are defined by $\log(L_1) < \log(L_{25\mu m}) \leq \log(L_2)$.

Table 3. Parameters of LLFs of Different Populations

Population	number	α	β	$L_*/L_\odot$	C(normalization)
Normals	456	0.482	3.876	5.7×10^9	0.00035
Starbursts	643	0.268	2.230	7.9×10^9	0.00066
AGNs	356	0.336	1.691	6.9×10^9	0.000090

Table 4. Evolution models. Parameters z_0 and z_1 specify the galaxy formation time and the ‘turn-over’ redshift, respectively; u_i and v_i ($i = 1, 2, 3$) specify the luminosity evolution functions (Eq(7)), and p_i and q_i ($i = 1, 2, 3$) specify the density evolution functions (Eq(8)).

model	z_1	z_0	Normals				Starbursts				AGNs			
			u_1	v_1	p_1	q_1	u_2	v_2	p_2	q_2	u_3	v_3	p_3	q_3
Model 1 [†]	1.5	7	1.5	-3	0	0	4.2	-3	2	-3	3.5	-3	0	0
Model 2 [‡]	1.5	7	1.5	0	0	0	4.2	0	2	0	3.5	0	0	0
Model 3	1.5	7	1.5	-3	0	0	5	-3	1	-3	3.5	-3	0	0
Model 4	1.5	7	1.5	-3	0	0	3.5	-3	3	-3	3.5	-3	0	0
Model 5	1.5	7	1.5	-1.5	0	0	4.2	-1.5	2	-1.5	3.5	-1.5	0	0

[†] ‘Peak Model’.

[‡] ‘Flat Model’.

Table A1. Parameters of $\log(f_{submm,i}/f_{100\mu m})$ vs. $\log(f_{100\mu m}/f_{60\mu m})$ relation

waveband	detections	upper limits	A_i	B_i	Figure
$170\mu m$	29		-0.3	1.0	Fig.27
$240\mu m$	6	14	-0.7	1.36	Fig.28
$450\mu m$	16	7	-1.58	1.44	Fig.29
$850\mu m$	121	1	-2.40	1.45	Fig.30
$1200\mu m$	62	4	-2.90	1.45	Fig.31, Fig.32

This figure "fig1a.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0009220v2>

This figure "fig1b.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0009220v2>

This figure "fig2a.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0009220v2>

This figure "fig2b.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0009220v2>

This figure "fig3.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0009220v2>

This figure "fig4.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0009220v2>

This figure "fig5.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0009220v2>

This figure "fig6.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0009220v2>

This figure "fig7.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0009220v2>

This figure "fig8.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0009220v2>

This figure "fig9.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0009220v2>

This figure "fig10.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0009220v2>

This figure "fig11.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0009220v2>

This figure "fig12.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0009220v2>

This figure "fig13.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0009220v2>

This figure "fig14.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0009220v2>

This figure "fig15.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0009220v2>

This figure "fig16.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0009220v2>

This figure "fig17.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0009220v2>

This figure "fig18.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0009220v2>

This figure "fig19.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0009220v2>

This figure "fig20a.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0009220v2>

This figure "fig20b.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0009220v2>

This figure "fig21a.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0009220v2>

This figure "fig21b.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0009220v2>

This figure "fig22.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0009220v2>

This figure "fig23.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0009220v2>

This figure "fig24.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0009220v2>

This figure "fig25.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0009220v2>

This figure "fig26.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0009220v2>

This figure "fig27.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0009220v2>

This figure "fig28.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0009220v2>

This figure "fig29.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0009220v2>

This figure "fig30.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0009220v2>

This figure "fig31.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0009220v2>

This figure "fig32.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/0009220v2>

Table 2. Average SEDs ($\log(f_\nu/f_{25\mu m})$) of IR sources in $\log(L_{25\mu m})$ bins. One- σ dispersions are also given.

$\log(\lambda)$	Normal Late-types						AGNs	
	$\log(L_{25\mu m}/L_\odot)$ bins						$\log(L_{25\mu m}/L_\odot)$ bins	
(μm)	7 ± 1	8.5 ± 0.5	9.2 ± 0.2	9.6 ± 0.2	10.0 ± 0.2	10.6 ± 0.4	8 ± 2	11 ± 1
-1.00	-1.31 $\pm$ 0.35	-1.78 $\pm$ 0.57	-2.20 $\pm$ 0.48	-2.31 $\pm$ 0.52	-2.65 $\pm$ 0.42	-2.80 $\pm$ 0.45	-2.68 $\pm$ 0.67	-3.30 $\pm$ 0.57
-0.76	-1.05 $\pm$ 0.44	-1.57 $\pm$ 0.44	-1.94 $\pm$ 0.44	-2.05 $\pm$ 0.45	-2.39 $\pm$ 0.41	-2.49 $\pm$ 0.44	-2.42 $\pm$ 0.69	-3.02 $\pm$ 0.57
-0.51	-0.82 $\pm$ 0.41	-1.21 $\pm$ 0.37	-1.56 $\pm$ 0.36	-1.68 $\pm$ 0.34	-1.99 $\pm$ 0.33	-2.11 $\pm$ 0.35	-2.07 $\pm$ 0.55	-2.63 $\pm$ 0.48
-0.27	-0.58 $\pm$ 0.33	-0.80 $\pm$ 0.35	-1.12 $\pm$ 0.29	-1.27 $\pm$ 0.24	-1.54 $\pm$ 0.25	-1.69 $\pm$ 0.25	-1.68 $\pm$ 0.40	-2.21 $\pm$ 0.40
-0.03	-0.35 $\pm$ 0.28	-0.42 $\pm$ 0.39	-0.72 $\pm$ 0.30	-0.88 $\pm$ 0.22	-1.11 $\pm$ 0.22	-1.29 $\pm$ 0.20	-1.31 $\pm$ 0.38	-1.81 $\pm$ 0.39
0.21	-0.15 $\pm$ 0.31	-0.18 $\pm$ 0.39	-0.45 $\pm$ 0.30	-0.62 $\pm$ 0.22	-0.83 $\pm$ 0.22	-1.00 $\pm$ 0.18	-1.06 $\pm$ 0.41	-1.52 $\pm$ 0.40
0.46	-0.42 $\pm$ 0.29	-0.47 $\pm$ 0.31	-0.67 $\pm$ 0.23	-0.79 $\pm$ 0.18	-0.96 $\pm$ 0.18	-1.08 $\pm$ 0.14	-1.19 $\pm$ 0.31	-1.42 $\pm$ 0.34
0.64	-0.64 $\pm$ 0.29	-0.79 $\pm$ 0.18	-0.85 $\pm$ 0.17	-0.91 $\pm$ 0.12	-1.00 $\pm$ 0.15	-1.06 $\pm$ 0.14	-1.18 $\pm$ 0.19	-1.19 $\pm$ 0.30
0.83	-0.27 $\pm$ 0.29	-0.43 $\pm$ 0.18	-0.49 $\pm$ 0.17	-0.57 $\pm$ 0.13	-0.69 $\pm$ 0.15	-0.75 $\pm$ 0.14	-0.89 $\pm$ 0.19	-0.93 $\pm$ 0.27
0.87	0.16 $\pm$ 0.28	-0.02 $\pm$ 0.18	-0.10 $\pm$ 0.17	-0.19 $\pm$ 0.13	-0.37 $\pm$ 0.18	-0.54 $\pm$ 0.15	-0.69 $\pm$ 0.25	-0.83 $\pm$ 0.25
0.91	0.05 $\pm$ 0.29	-0.10 $\pm$ 0.18	-0.16 $\pm$ 0.16	-0.22 $\pm$ 0.12	-0.28 $\pm$ 0.14	-0.25 $\pm$ 0.14	-0.64 $\pm$ 0.21	-0.70 $\pm$ 0.26
0.95	-0.35 $\pm$ 0.30	-0.46 $\pm$ 0.17	-0.49 $\pm$ 0.16	-0.51 $\pm$ 0.11	-0.54 $\pm$ 0.14	-0.49 $\pm$ 0.14	-0.77 $\pm$ 0.17	-0.73 $\pm$ 0.26
0.99	-0.43 $\pm$ 0.29	-0.59 $\pm$ 0.17	-0.65 $\pm$ 0.16	-0.69 $\pm$ 0.11	-0.74 $\pm$ 0.13	-0.74 $\pm$ 0.12	-0.80 $\pm$ 0.18	-0.78 $\pm$ 0.26
1.04	-0.21 $\pm$ 0.28	-0.39 $\pm$ 0.18	-0.47 $\pm$ 0.16	-0.54 $\pm$ 0.12	-0.62 $\pm$ 0.13	-0.63 $\pm$ 0.12	-0.65 $\pm$ 0.17	-0.66 $\pm$ 0.25
1.08	0.15 $\pm$ 0.29	0.00 $\pm$ 0.17	-0.06 $\pm$ 0.16	-0.12 $\pm$ 0.11	-0.19 $\pm$ 0.14	-0.17 $\pm$ 0.13	-0.43 $\pm$ 0.17	-0.48 $\pm$ 0.24
1.12	0.07 $\pm$ 0.29	-0.07 $\pm$ 0.17	-0.11 $\pm$ 0.15	-0.15 $\pm$ 0.11	-0.19 $\pm$ 0.13	-0.18 $\pm$ 0.11	-0.39 $\pm$ 0.15	-0.40 $\pm$ 0.22
1.16	-0.07 $\pm$ 0.29	-0.21 $\pm$ 0.16	-0.26 $\pm$ 0.14	-0.32 $\pm$ 0.10	-0.39 $\pm$ 0.12	-0.42 $\pm$ 0.08	-0.39 $\pm$ 0.14	-0.37 $\pm$ 0.21
1.20	-0.04 $\pm$ 0.29	-0.19 $\pm$ 0.16	-0.24 $\pm$ 0.14	-0.30 $\pm$ 0.10	-0.37 $\pm$ 0.11	-0.40 $\pm$ 0.07	-0.35 $\pm$ 0.14	-0.31 $\pm$ 0.21
1.25	-0.06 $\pm$ 0.21	-0.17 $\pm$ 0.12	-0.20 $\pm$ 0.11	-0.25 $\pm$ 0.08	-0.31 $\pm$ 0.09	-0.34 $\pm$ 0.06	-0.27 $\pm$ 0.11	-0.25 $\pm$ 0.18
1.29	-0.07 $\pm$ 0.14	-0.14 $\pm$ 0.08	-0.16 $\pm$ 0.07	-0.19 $\pm$ 0.05	-0.23 $\pm$ 0.06	-0.25 $\pm$ 0.04	-0.20 $\pm$ 0.08	-0.18 $\pm$ 0.13
1.34	-0.06 $\pm$ 0.06	-0.08 $\pm$ 0.04	-0.09 $\pm$ 0.03	-0.11 $\pm$ 0.02	-0.13 $\pm$ 0.02	-0.14 $\pm$ 0.02	-0.10 $\pm$ 0.04	-0.09 $\pm$ 0.06
1.40	0.00 $\pm$ 0.00	0.00 $\pm$ 0.00	0.00 $\pm$ 0.00	0.00 $\pm$ 0.00	0.00 $\pm$ 0.00	0.00 $\pm$ 0.00	0.00 $\pm$ 0.00	0.00 $\pm$ 0.00
1.51	0.25 $\pm$ 0.02	0.24 $\pm$ 0.03	0.24 $\pm$ 0.03	0.24 $\pm$ 0.03	0.25 $\pm$ 0.02	0.26 $\pm$ 0.02	0.18 $\pm$ 0.05	0.16 $\pm$ 0.08
1.66	0.75 $\pm$ 0.15	0.67 $\pm$ 0.08	0.63 $\pm$ 0.08	0.62 $\pm$ 0.06	0.61 $\pm$ 0.07	0.63 $\pm$ 0.07	0.39 $\pm$ 0.12	0.34 $\pm$ 0.15
1.81	1.19 $\pm$ 0.26	1.07 $\pm$ 0.13	1.00 $\pm$ 0.12	0.97 $\pm$ 0.08	0.94 $\pm$ 0.11	0.94 $\pm$ 0.10	0.57 $\pm$ 0.18	0.48 $\pm$ 0.20
1.96	1.42 $\pm$ 0.24	1.37 $\pm$ 0.14	1.27 $\pm$ 0.12	1.23 $\pm$ 0.09	1.20 $\pm$ 0.11	1.18 $\pm$ 0.10	0.71 $\pm$ 0.24	0.55 $\pm$ 0.23
2.11	1.57 $\pm$ 0.23	1.56 $\pm$ 0.17	1.44 $\pm$ 0.15	1.39 $\pm$ 0.12	1.36 $\pm$ 0.15	1.31 $\pm$ 0.10	0.75 $\pm$ 0.33	0.53 $\pm$ 0.30
2.26	1.53 $\pm$ 0.25	1.55 $\pm$ 0.20	1.41 $\pm$ 0.18	1.35 $\pm$ 0.15	1.31 $\pm$ 0.18	1.25 $\pm$ 0.12	0.59 $\pm$ 0.41	0.32 $\pm$ 0.37
2.41	1.21 $\pm$ 0.25	1.26 $\pm$ 0.22	1.10 $\pm$ 0.19	1.04 $\pm$ 0.17	1.00 $\pm$ 0.20	0.92 $\pm$ 0.12	0.22 $\pm$ 0.46	-0.08 $\pm$ 0.41
2.55	0.75 $\pm$ 0.25	0.80 $\pm$ 0.22	0.64 $\pm$ 0.20	0.58 $\pm$ 0.17	0.54 $\pm$ 0.20	0.46 $\pm$ 0.12	-0.25 $\pm$ 0.46	-0.55 $\pm$ 0.41
2.70	0.29 $\pm$ 0.25	0.33 $\pm$ 0.22	0.17 $\pm$ 0.19	0.12 $\pm$ 0.17	0.07 $\pm$ 0.20	0.00 $\pm$ 0.12	-0.71 $\pm$ 0.46	-1.01 $\pm$ 0.41
2.85	-0.14 $\pm$ 0.25	-0.09 $\pm$ 0.22	-0.25 $\pm$ 0.19	-0.31 $\pm$ 0.17	-0.35 $\pm$ 0.20	-0.43 $\pm$ 0.12	-1.14 $\pm$ 0.46	-1.44 $\pm$ 0.41
2.99	-0.59 $\pm$ 0.25	-0.54 $\pm$ 0.22	-0.70 $\pm$ 0.20	-0.76 $\pm$ 0.17	-0.80 $\pm$ 0.20	-0.88 $\pm$ 0.12	-1.59 $\pm$ 0.46	-1.89 $\pm$ 0.41
3.19	-1.20 $\pm$ 0.25	-1.16 $\pm$ 0.21	-1.31 $\pm$ 0.19	-1.37 $\pm$ 0.17	-1.41 $\pm$ 0.20	-1.48 $\pm$ 0.12	-2.19 $\pm$ 0.45	-2.47 $\pm$ 0.40
3.53	-1.83 $\pm$ 0.29	-1.79 $\pm$ 0.19	-1.90 $\pm$ 0.18	-1.94 $\pm$ 0.15	-1.97 $\pm$ 0.18	-2.02 $\pm$ 0.13	-2.68 $\pm$ 0.39	-2.86 $\pm$ 0.34
3.86	-2.06 $\pm$ 0.35	-2.04 $\pm$ 0.18	-2.07 $\pm$ 0.19	-2.10 $\pm$ 0.14	-2.09 $\pm$ 0.17	-2.12 $\pm$ 0.15	-2.72 $\pm$ 0.35	-2.73 $\pm$ 0.37
4.20	-2.02 $\pm$ 0.41	-2.01 $\pm$ 0.21	-1.98 $\pm$ 0.21	-1.99 $\pm$ 0.15	-1.96 $\pm$ 0.19	-1.96 $\pm$ 0.19	-2.51 $\pm$ 0.38	-2.37 $\pm$ 0.49
4.54	-1.83 $\pm$ 0.44	-1.82 $\pm$ 0.23	-1.77 $\pm$ 0.22	-1.77 $\pm$ 0.16	-1.73 $\pm$ 0.20	-1.71 $\pm$ 0.21	-2.24 $\pm$ 0.41	-2.03 $\pm$ 0.56
4.87	-1.58 $\pm$ 0.43	-1.58 $\pm$ 0.23	-1.53 $\pm$ 0.22	-1.53 $\pm$ 0.16	-1.49 $\pm$ 0.20	-1.48 $\pm$ 0.21	-2.01 $\pm$ 0.41	-1.81 $\pm$ 0.55
5.21	-1.32 $\pm$ 0.43	-1.31 $\pm$ 0.23	-1.26 $\pm$ 0.22	-1.26 $\pm$ 0.16	-1.23 $\pm$ 0.20	-1.21 $\pm$ 0.21	-1.74 $\pm$ 0.41	-1.54 $\pm$ 0.55

Table 2. Continue.

$\log(\lambda)$	Starburst Galaxies							
	$\log(L_{25\mu m}/L_{\odot})$ bins							
(μm)	7 ± 1	8.5 ± 0.5	9.2 ± 0.2	9.6 ± 0.2	10.0 ± 0.2	10.4 ± 0.2	10.8 ± 0.2	11.5 ± 0.5
-1.00	-1.54±0.04	-2.16±0.51	-2.45±0.56	-2.73±0.57	-2.95±0.46	-3.20±0.45	-3.25±0.51	-3.81±0.61
-0.76	-1.26±0.06	-1.95±0.49	-2.20±0.53	-2.48±0.56	-2.69±0.47	-2.95±0.46	-3.01±0.54	-3.53±0.53
-0.51	-1.04±0.04	-1.63±0.39	-1.84±0.41	-2.08±0.42	-2.29±0.36	-2.52±0.36	-2.64±0.42	-3.12±0.40
-0.27	-0.85±0.01	-1.26±0.30	-1.44±0.27	-1.62±0.27	-1.84±0.26	-2.03±0.26	-2.22±0.28	-2.66±0.32
-0.03	-0.65±0.01	-0.91±0.32	-1.07±0.21	-1.19±0.24	-1.41±0.29	-1.57±0.25	-1.83±0.25	-2.23±0.34
0.21	-0.45±0.02	-0.70±0.36	-0.82±0.22	-0.93±0.27	-1.14±0.31	-1.28±0.25	-1.56±0.26	-1.92±0.33
0.46	-0.73±0.02	-0.93±0.29	-1.00±0.19	-1.08±0.23	-1.25±0.26	-1.37±0.23	-1.56±0.23	-1.93±0.30
0.64	-0.94±0.15	-1.10±0.20	-1.10±0.21	-1.17±0.26	-1.27±0.29	-1.38±0.31	-1.45±0.30	-1.89±0.34
0.83	-0.57±0.14	-0.73±0.19	-0.74±0.20	-0.82±0.23	-0.93±0.26	-1.03±0.27	-1.02±0.30	-1.31±0.37
0.87	-0.14±0.15	-0.32±0.19	-0.34±0.20	-0.45±0.23	-0.60±0.27	-0.80±0.27	-0.90±0.25	-1.31±0.27
0.91	-0.25±0.14	-0.41±0.19	-0.41±0.20	-0.47±0.23	-0.53±0.26	-0.55±0.27	-0.53±0.30	-0.89±0.31
0.95	-0.64±0.13	-0.74±0.16	-0.71±0.17	-0.74±0.20	-0.77±0.22	-0.76±0.24	-0.72±0.28	-1.06±0.30
0.99	-0.73±0.14	-0.87±0.16	-0.87±0.17	-0.91±0.19	-0.94±0.20	-0.97±0.18	-1.04±0.17	-1.31±0.21
1.04	-0.50±0.14	-0.65±0.13	-0.67±0.15	-0.73±0.15	-0.78±0.17	-0.84±0.15	-0.92±0.14	-1.19±0.15
1.08	-0.14±0.14	-0.27±0.14	-0.27±0.16	-0.32±0.17	-0.38±0.19	-0.40±0.20	-0.36±0.24	-0.72±0.25
1.12	-0.22±0.13	-0.32±0.12	-0.31±0.14	-0.33±0.15	-0.35±0.16	-0.35±0.13	-0.37±0.12	-0.56±0.15
1.16	-0.35±0.12	-0.42±0.07	-0.42±0.10	-0.44±0.09	-0.47±0.09	-0.48±0.05	-0.49±0.05	-0.57±0.12
1.20	-0.32±0.11	-0.39±0.07	-0.39±0.10	-0.41±0.08	-0.43±0.08	-0.41±0.04	-0.43±0.06	-0.47±0.11
1.25	-0.26±0.08	-0.32±0.05	-0.32±0.07	-0.33±0.06	-0.36±0.06	-0.37±0.03	-0.38±0.03	-0.41±0.09
1.29	-0.21±0.06	-0.24±0.03	-0.24±0.05	-0.25±0.04	-0.26±0.04	-0.27±0.02	-0.28±0.02	-0.31±0.06
1.34	-0.12±0.02	-0.13±0.01	-0.13±0.02	-0.14±0.02	-0.14±0.02	-0.15±0.01	-0.15±0.01	-0.16±0.03
1.40	0.00±0.00	0.00±0.00	0.00±0.00	0.00±0.00	0.00±0.00	0.00±0.00	0.00±0.00	0.00±0.00
1.51	0.29±0.01	0.27±0.02	0.28±0.02	0.28±0.02	0.28±0.03	0.29±0.04	0.29±0.03	0.31±0.05
1.66	0.74±0.03	0.66±0.07	0.67±0.07	0.66±0.08	0.65±0.08	0.68±0.10	0.67±0.08	0.70±0.11
1.81	1.10±0.06	0.95±0.12	0.96±0.11	0.94±0.12	0.92±0.12	0.94±0.13	0.91±0.11	0.90±0.15
1.96	1.28±0.06	1.09±0.15	1.10±0.13	1.07±0.15	1.04±0.14	1.04±0.14	0.99±0.13	0.90±0.17
2.11	1.38±0.05	1.14±0.19	1.14±0.17	1.11±0.19	1.07±0.17	1.05±0.17	0.97±0.17	0.81±0.22
2.26	1.29±0.06	1.01±0.22	1.01±0.21	0.98±0.23	0.93±0.21	0.89±0.21	0.80±0.22	0.58±0.28
2.41	0.95±0.06	0.65±0.24	0.65±0.23	0.61±0.25	0.56±0.23	0.51±0.23	0.41±0.24	0.15±0.31
2.55	0.48±0.06	0.19±0.24	0.18±0.24	0.15±0.25	0.10±0.23	0.04±0.23	-0.06±0.25	-0.32±0.31
2.70	0.02±0.06	-0.27±0.24	-0.28±0.23	-0.32±0.25	-0.37±0.23	-0.42±0.23	-0.52±0.25	-0.78±0.31
2.85	-0.40±0.06	-0.70±0.24	-0.70±0.23	-0.74±0.25	-0.79±0.23	-0.85±0.23	-0.95±0.25	-1.20±0.31
2.99	-0.86±0.06	-1.15±0.24	-1.16±0.24	-1.19±0.25	-1.24±0.23	-1.30±0.23	-1.40±0.25	-1.66±0.31
3.19	-1.47±0.05	-1.76±0.24	-1.76±0.23	-1.79±0.25	-1.84±0.23	-1.90±0.23	-2.00±0.24	-2.25±0.31
3.53	-2.11±0.03	-2.29±0.22	-2.28±0.21	-2.30±0.23	-2.35±0.21	-2.40±0.22	-2.47±0.22	-2.69±0.31
3.86	-2.35±0.00	-2.39±0.20	-2.36±0.21	-2.37±0.23	-2.42±0.20	-2.45±0.22	-2.48±0.21	-2.65±0.33
4.20	-2.32±0.04	-2.22±0.21	-2.18±0.23	-2.18±0.24	-2.22±0.20	-2.25±0.24	-2.24±0.22	-2.36±0.36
4.54	-2.14±0.05	-1.98±0.22	-1.93±0.24	-1.92±0.25	-1.96±0.21	-1.99±0.25	-1.96±0.23	-2.06±0.38
4.87	-1.89±0.05	-1.74±0.22	-1.69±0.24	-1.68±0.25	-1.73±0.21	-1.75±0.24	-1.73±0.23	-1.83±0.37
5.21	-1.62±0.05	-1.48±0.22	-1.42±0.24	-1.42±0.25	-1.46±0.21	-1.48±0.24	-1.46±0.23	-1.56±0.37